A DISCOURSE Concerning The Christian Sabbath.

SIR, *June* 12. 1692.

I Had a while since a Book sent me by the Carrier (I know not well from whom) of Mr. *Thomas Bampfield*, which in the Title-Page, is said to be *Printed for the Author* —— 1692. It is Concerning the *Sabbath*. Which he thinks should rather be Observed on what we call *Saturday*, than on what we call *Sunday*.

I should not, on this Account, give any Disturbance to the Peace or Practise of the Church where I live, so that a Sabbath be duly Observed as to the *Substantials* of it, though perhaps not upon what day I should chuse.

For I do not know, and I believe no man living can tell me, whether what we now call *Sunday*, be a *First*, a *Second*, a *Third*, or a *Seventh* day, in a continued Circulation of *Weeks* from the *Creation*. And what it is impossible for me to know, I think will be no Crime to be Ignorant of. Nor hath this Author any other way than common *Tradition*, (on which he is not willing that we should lay weight,) whereby to guess, which is the First, or which is the Seventh day, in such a Circulation of Weeks, either from the *Creation*, or even from *Christ's Time*.

I am sufficiently satisfied that we ought to keep a *Sabbath*, that is, *a day of Holy Rest, after Six days of ordinary Labour*, according to the Fourth Commandment: and this in a continued Course or Circulation: But I am not certain, nor can I be, which

is a First, or a Seventh day in such a Circulation of Weeks from the Creation. And therefore shall content my self to observe that day which I find observed in the Church where I live. In *Old England* I observe the Sabbath which here I find; And if I were in *New-England*, I would observe the Sabbath which I find observed there. Though I think it may be disputable whether they and we may be said to observe the same day, (the First Meridian passing between them and us.) And yet I would not advise to have it changed in either.

Now I can hardly think, that God hath laid the great stress of so weighty a Point (as whereon the main of Gods publick Worship doth much depend) on such a Circumstance as is impossible for us to know, and of which we may be modestly ignorant.

I should rather think that what Christ says of the *Place*, *Joh.* 4. 21, 23, *The hour cometh when ye shall neither in this Mountain nor in Jerusalem worship the Father, but the true worshipers shall worship the Father in Spirit and in Truth*, is in good measure true of the *Time* also; And, as it is not so material whether in this or that *Place*, God be Worshiped, so he be *Worshiped Aright*: so neither is it so material, whether on this, or that *day*; as, that a *Sabbath* or day of *Holy Rest* be duly kept. The publick Worship of God, was then in great measure confined to the *Temple*; not indifferently, *in any place within thy Gates*, but in the place *which the Lord thy God shall chuse, to put his name there*, Deut. 16. 6, 11, 15, 16. For which any other place may *now* be as well assigned; that men pray *every where lifting up holy hands*, &c. 1 *Tim.* 2. 8. (Privately in private places, and Publickly in places appointed for the publick.) And I do not think we are now more confined to the *Jewish Sabbath*, than to the *Jewish Temple*.

This premised, I can agree with this Author in many things by him discussed.

I agree, that *Our Lord Jesus Christ* (according to his *Divinity*) was *God* (and is so) the *true God*, the God that *made Heaven and Earth*, *the God who delivered the Law upon Mount Sinai*. For though we do acknowledge, in the Godhead, a *Trinity of Persons*; Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, (whereof Christ according to his Divinity is called the *Second Person*, the *Son of God*, or *God the Son*;) yet those *Three Persons* are but *One God*. Nor do I know any other *true God* but *One*, The *God that made Heaven and Earth*, The *Lord Jehovah*, The *God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*, The *Lord God of Israel*, The *Lord their God who brought them out of the Land of Egypt, out of the House of Bondage*, *and besides whom*

whom we are to have no Other God, The God who *delivered the Law to them on Mount Sinai*; And I do agree that *Our Lord Jesus Christ, is* (as to his Divinity) *this* God, the *True* God, the *onely true God*, and that he was so before his Incarnation. How far each of those Actions are to be ascribed to this or that *Person of the Trinity*, we need not be over solicitous. What in the New Testament is more peculiarly ascribed to this or that of the Three Persons, is in the Old Testament wont to be ascribed to *God* indefinitely, without such particular application; the doctrine of the Trinity being then not so distinctly discovered. But I cannot agree that Christ as *God and Man* (in contradistinction to the *Father and Holy Ghost*) did all those things; for he was not then *Man*.

I agree with him also; that God who made the World in *Six* days, *Rested the Seventh day*, Gen. 2. 3. Exod. 20. 11. And that he *Blessed the Sabbath day and Hallowed it*. And that accordingly he hath appointed after *Six* days of ordinary *Labour*, Man should observe a *Seventh* day of *Holy Rest*, and this in a continued succession.

But I should rather say, that *our Lord Jesus Christ is* (according to his Divinity) *that God who Blessed the Seventh day* Gen. 2. than that *the God who Blessed the Sabbath day, is the Lord Jesus Christ*; (as he doth *p.* 64. and elsewhere very often, seeming to lay great stress upon it.) For he was not then the *Lord Christ* (God and Man) nor did he bless it as *Christ*, but as *God*; in Union with the Father and Holy Ghost, not as contradistinguished from them.

I agree also, that the Law of the *Sabbath* is one of the *Decalogue* or *Ten Commandments* delivered to *Israel* on Mount *Sinai*. Ex. 20. But I am willing to think it was a Law before. Not only because we find it observed, *Exod.* 16. (before the giving of the Law on Mount *Sinai*, Ex. 20.) but especially because of that in *Gen.* 2. 3. *God blessed the Seventh day and Sanctified it, because in it he rested from all his Work*. And those who are most averse to the Morality (as it is wont to be called) or the *Perpetuity* of the *Sabbath*, or *Day of Holy Rest*, and are yet very zealous for the *Holiness of Places*, would be very fond of it if they could find so clear a Testimony, and so ancient, for the holiness of *Place*, as here is for that of *Time*.

I agree also that the Law of the *Decalogue* or *Ten Commandments*, though then given peculiarly to *Israel*, is Obligatory to *Us* also. For though some Clauses therein do peculiarly respect them; as that *who brought thee out of the land of Egypt out of the*

houſe of bondage, and *that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee*, (which I think is there ſaid with a particular reſpect to the land of *Canaan*, which God *gave* to *Iſrael*, not to us;) yet the Body of that Law and the preceptive part of it, I take to be Obligatory to others alſo, and to Us in particular; the Decalogue being *Declarative* of what was (I think) a *Law before* (however neglected or forgotten,) and is by Chriſt and his Apoſtles frequently cited as ſuch, even to Gentiles as well as Jews.

Nor will I diſpute it with him, whether the *Sabbath* were obſerved *from the Creation to the Floud*. For I am willing to think that if it were not, it ſhould have been; though, in the ſhort Hiſtory that *Moſes* gives us of that time, there be no mention made of ſuch Obſervation. But I doubt it was not *univerſally* ſo obſerved, if at all. For when *all fleſh had corrupted their ways*, I doubt the Sabbath day and the worſhip of that day were by them not much regarded. Nor do I find (*Gen.* 2. 3.) any *expreſs Command* (ſuch as he demands for the *Firſt days* Sabbath) that it ſhould be obſerved thenceforth by Men, *every Seventh day* of the Week *for ever*. How far the words *he bleſſed and ſanctified it* may extend I will not diſpute. It may be a *ſtrong Intimation* (and I think it is,) But it is not expreſly ſaid, that, *All Mankind muſt, for ever after, obſerve every Seventh day, in every Week, of days, reckoned continually from the firſt Creation*. Nor do I think it neceſſary to have been ſo recorded by *Moſes*, (any more, than the Law for *Sacrifices*,) if it did otherwiſe appear to have been the Will of God. And therefore I would not have him lay too great a ſtreſs, on what he ſaith, that *there is no expreſs Commandment, Recorded in the New Teſtament, for obſerving the Firſt day*: It is enough if we there find ſufficient Intimation for us to judge that God was pleaſed to have it obſerved.

I ſay the like as to the time from the Floud to that of *Abraham*, and from thence to the coming of *Iſracl* out of *Egypt*. For I do not find any mention of their obſerving a Sabbath (either in the Writings of *Moſes*, or the Book of *Job*) earlier than that of *Exod.* 16. after *Iſraels* coming out of *Egypt*, and after the time that God is ſaid to have *made a ſtatute and ordinance for them, at Marah*, Ex. 15. 25. What that Statute and Ordinance was, we cannot tell. The Jewiſh Writers think (or ſome of them) that it was that of the *Sabbath*; and perhaps it might, or this be ſome part of it. It was perhaps a Revival of what had been before diſuſed. Nor is it likely that their Task-Maſters in *Egypt* would

would ſuffer them to be Idle, and neglect their Work, one whole day in Seven.

Nor do I find any foot-ſteps in Hiſtory that any other Nation but the Jews did (for many Ages after this time) ſo much as meaſure out their time by Weeks.

I know that many Learned and Pious men have been ſearching to that purpoſe and willing to lay hold on any thing that might ſeem to look that way. And I ſhould be well enough pleaſed to ſee it made out. But I have not ſeen any thing convictive to give me ſatisfaction therein.

I have conſulted *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and what he cites in the Fifth Book of his *Stromata*, who hath I believe made the beſt ſearch of any into Heathen Writers for that purpoſe. His deſign in that Book is to ſhew that the Heathens had ſtollen or borrowed much of their *Philoſophy* from what he calls *Philoſophia Barbara*, or *Barbarorum*, meaning thereby the *Jewiſh Learning*; (for, with the *Greeks*, all but themſelves were *Barbarians*.) And amongſt many other things, he takes notice of the number *Seven* ſometimes mentioned in Heathen Writers, as with ſome veneration; which he thinks to be occaſioned from that number ofe mentioned in the Sacred Writers, and particularly from that of their *Sabbath*, and meaſuring their time by *Weeks*. But he doth not at all intimate as if himſelf did think the *Heathens* ſo to have divided their time, or to keep that Sabbath, but only that they were acquainted with the Jewiſh Learning, and borrowed much of theirs from thence.

That which therein ſeemed to me the moſt promiſing (and by others alſo is oft alledged) was that Cited from *Heſiod*, ἑβδόμη ἱερὸν ἦμαρ (*the Seventh a Sacred day.*) But when I conſulted the place in *Heſiod*, in his Ἔργα καὶ ἡμέραι, (in the latter part of which he treats of *Days*) I find nothing there of *Weeks*, or *days of the Week*, but only *days of the Month*. For 'tis this he there propoſeth to ſpeak of, τριηκάδα μητὸς, (*the Thirty days of the Month*,) on which he makes divers Remarks; as, which of them were to be accounted *Good days*, and which *Bad days*, and, for *what purpoſes*. And begins with theſe,

Πρῶτον, ἔνη, τετράς τε, καὶ ἑβδόμη, ἱερὸν ἦμαρ,
Τῇ γὰρ Ἀπόλλωνα χρυσάορα γείνατο Λητώ.

(*Begin we with the Firſt, and the Fourth, and the Seventh, a Sacred day, Becauſe that on this day* Apollo *who hath the Golden*

Sword

Sword was born of Latona.) So that (it ſeems) the *Seventh* day (not the *Firſt*) was then *Sunday*. (For *Apollo with his Gold Sword*, is but another name for the *Sun*.) But it was the Seventh day of the *Month*, not the Seventh day of the *Week*, (for of *Weeks* he there ſays nothing.) And he then goes on to ſpeak of the *Eighth* and *Ninth* days; then of the *Eleventh* and *Twelfth*, next of the *Thirteenth*, and ſo of other days of the Month; ſhewing which of them were accounted *Lucky* days, and which *Unlucky*, and *for what Affairs*. But nothing of Weeks at all.

However, *Heſiod* himſelf, though one of the Oldeſt of the Heathen Writers, is but young as to the times we ſpeak of; who is reckoned to have lived about the time of King *Uzziah*, Seven Hundred years after the time we are now conſidering, upon the coming of *Iſrael* out of *Egypt*. Nor doth *Clemens Alexandrinus* think, when they name *Seven*, it was from any *Old Tradition* (from *Adam* or *Noah*) but from what acquaintance they then had with the Jewiſh Writers of later time.

Nor do I find any thing that is more to the purpoſe, in all there Cited by *Clemens Alexandrinus* than this of *Heſiod*. But if any where he could have found, that the *Heathens divided their Time by Weeks*; no doubt but he would have mentioned this as *borrowed from the Jewiſh Learning*; (which was the thing he was there inquiring after.) And, when he ſaith nothing of it, we may be ſure he could not find it. I find indeed that ſome of the Heathens (as *Juvenal* and *Lucian*) do laugh or jeer at the Jewiſh Sabbath (*recutitaque Sabbata pallent*) and therefore did *know* of the Jewiſh Sabbath; But not that they did obſerve it, or ſo much as divide their Time by Weeks.

Now if we ſhould admit, that in ſome Families (where the true Worſhip of God was preſerved) there be a ſtrong preſumption (for 'tis no more) that they did obſerve a *Sabbath*; that is, *a Seventh day of Holy Reſt after Six days of ordinary Labour*; yet 'tis a queſtion, whether that were juſt the Seventh day in a continual ſucceſſion of Weeks from the Creation.

And if at any time there chance to be an intermiſſion, and the day forgotten, it is impoſſible (without a Miracle or a new Revelation) that it can be reſtored again. And if from thenceforth they would again keep a Sabbath (as we find the Paſs-over was revived by *Hezekiah* and *Joſiah* which had been long intermitted 2 *Kings* 23. and 2 *Chr.* 25.) they muſt begin at adventure, and thence continue it.

Now if we conſider, that the true Worſhip of God was oft reduced

duced to some one family, as in the time of *Noah*, and perhaps of *Abraham*; and even that Family sometimes corrupt enough, (as was that of *Nahor*, from whence *Abraham* for that reason was removed; and that of *Laban* where *Jacob* sojourned; and how oft also the like happened, we cannot tell) It was very possible the *Sabbath* might be neglected; as himself observes *p.* 63, it had been *before and under the Captivity for a long time*, and made *a Market-day*, as well as any other day of the Week; like as the *Temple* was become a *Market-place*, *Mat.* 21. 12, 13. *Joh.* 2. 14-16. As was also the Pass-over in great measure from the time of *Samuel* till that of *Josiah*, 2 *Chr.* 35. 18. And the Feast of *Tabernacles*, from the days of *Joshuah* to *Nehemiah*, Neh. 8. 17. And Circumcision, for Forty years together in the Wilderness, *Josh.* 5. 5.

Now if *Circumcision* and the *Pass-over* and the Feast of *Tabernacles* were thus neglected when they were *at Liberty*; how much more the *Sabbath*, when they were *Bond-men* in *Egypt*; of which we have not the least mention from God's keeping a Sabbath, *Gen.* 2. 3. till after Israels coming out of *Egypt*, *Exod.* 16.

Nor is there the least mention (as I shew'd but now) in any History Sacred or Prosane, so much as of dividing their time by *Weeks*, all that time; nor, except that of Israel, for many Ages after.

And though the *Sun*, *Moon and Stars* (*Gen.* 1. 14.) are said to be *for Signs and for Seasons*, *for Days and for Years*, yet not a word is there of *Weeks*. Nor could they indeed, by their Motions, distinguish *Weeks*, as they do *Months* and *Years*. And therefore though I find *Years* and *Months* to have been observed all the World over long ago; yet *Weeks* no where (that I know) of ancient times, but by the Nation of the *Jews* onely, nor by them before their coming out of *Egypt*.

So that, though, I am willing to think, the Sabbath *ought* to have been observed all that while, yet there is too much reason to doubt it *was not*; or, if at all, not without frequent intermissions, which would, in this case, be fatal.

Now to argue as he doth, that *Abel*, and *Enoch*, and *Noah*, and *Abraham*, were *good men*, and are (some of them) said to *walk with God*, and to *keep his Commandments*, and therefore may be presumed to have *kept a Sabbath*, is but a weak argument as to matter of *Fact*, and, to *beg the Question*. For we are not to think them *so good* as to be guilty of no *failings* or *omissions*.

The Law of *Marriage* is certainly as Old, if not Older than that of the *Sabbath*, the tenour of which was (he tells us *p.* 62.) that *they Two should be one ſh ſh*; *not*, *they Three*, *Four or Five*: yet

he

he tells us alſo, that *Polygamy, or having many Wives, was frequently practiſed, from Lamech to Malachi, even by ſome eminent in the Church at that time, and by them (he ſuppoſeth) held to be lawful.* And it may as well be thought, the Law for the *Sabbath* might ſometime within that *Two Thouſand Five Hundred Years*) be neglected and forgotten; as that of *Marriage*; In a time when there was no writing (that we know of) to preſerve it. And, if once forgotten, it could never (as to *that* Seventh day) be recovered.

And I would ask that Gentleman, In caſe the day ſhould chance to have been ſometime forgotten, (as is very poſſible and not unlikely,) and that after ſuch time (upon finding *the Book of the Law*, as in *Joſiah*'s time 2 *Kings* 22. 8. which had been loſt) it did appear that a *Sabbath ſhould have been kept*, but was not, (as was there the caſe of the *Paſs-over*, *Chap.* 23. 21.) What doth this Gentleman think (in ſuch caſe) ſhould be done? Muſt they *never Reſtore the Sabbath* becauſe they do not know the day? Or muſt they begin upon a *New Account*? I ſhould think this latter; (and that it would be warranted by the *Fourth Commandment*;) notwithſtanding his Objection, No *other day* (but the Seventh from the Creation) *is Commanded*; No *Promiſe* to the Obſervance of *any other*; nor *Threatning* for the Omiſſion.

Indeed in our days when ſo great a part of the World reckon by *Weeks*, and we be ſtored with Aſtronomical Tables adjuſted to the Motions of the Sun, Moon and Stars, and many Celeſtial Obſervations, (as for Inſtance, that ſuch a Year, ſuch a Day of ſuch a Month there was an Eclipſe on Monday morning or the like) 'twere more eaſy to rectify ſuch an intermiſſion. But in thoſe days, when there was nothing of all this, nor ſo much as the uſe of Writing (that we know of) older than *Moſes*; There was no way to rectify an interrupted Tradition.

All which is not ſaid to diſparage the Obſervation of the Sabbath day (for which I have as great Veneration as he that pleads for the *Saturday* Sabbath,) But onely to ſhew, that we can be at no Certainty, (and ſcarce a Conjecture,) which is the Firſt, Second, or Seventh day of the Week in a continued Circulation of Weeks from the Creation. And conſequently I cannot think that the great ſtreſs of the Fourth Commandment is to be underſtood of juſt *that* Seventh day in every ſuch Week from the Creation (which I doubt cannot be known) But rather that there ſhould be a Weekly Sabbath; that is, after Six days of Work, the Seventh ſhould be a Holy Reſt, and then, after another Six days of Work, the Seventh ſhould be again a Holy Reſt; and ſo continu-

tinually; which is as truly observed in the Sunday-Sabbath, as in that of Saturday.

As when God requires *the Tenth* of our *Increaſe*; it is not meant of the Tenth *in Order* (for it ſhould rather be the Firſt in Order, for he requires the *Firſt-fruits*) but the Tenth in *Proportion*; So here the *Seventh*.

And this Author knows very well, that it is ſignally noted by Expoſitors on the Fourth Commandment, and other Writers about the Sabbath, That this Commandment begins with *Remember to keep Holy the Sabbath-day*, or the day of Reſt, (not the *Seventh day*; much leſs the Seventh day of the Week *from the firſt Creation*;) And what is that day of Reſt, the next Words tell us, *Six days ſhalt thou labour, but the Seventh is the Sabbath, &c.* That is, after Six days of Labour, the Seventh ſhall be a day of Reſt. And in the cloſe of that Commandment (*Ex.* 20. 11.) our Bibles have it *wherefore the Lord bleſſed the Sabbath-day* (not as we commonly repeat it, the *Seventh* day) *and hallowed it*. The Reaſon given to inforce it is, *For in Six days the Lord made Heaven and Earth* &c. *and reſted the Seventh day*, and accordingly ſhould we, after Six days of Work have a Seventh day of Reſt, and ſo onward.

If he thinks that to make a difference, that we now reckon our Weeks to begin with the day of Reſt, and after that, Six Working days (which in a continued Circulation comes all to one,) I will allow that Gentleman (if that will pleaſe him better) to begin the Week on *Monday*, and then Sunday will be the *Seventh*. The Commandment ſays nothing of the *Seventh* day of the Week in a continued Succeſſion *from the Creation*; but *the Seventh day* after *Six days of Labour*.

And whereas he obſerves (and would lay great weight upon it) that it is (*haſhebigni*) *the Seventh* (the article *ha* anſwering to our *the*) not *a Seventh*. 'Tis very true, and very proper ſo to be. For the meaning is not that, after *Six* days of Labour, there ſhould be a *Seventh* for Reſt *no matter when*; but *the Seventh* day, that is, *the next* day after thoſe Six. But it is not ſaid *the Seventh in Courſe from the Creation*. Juſt as when it is ſaid, a Male-Child is to be Circumciſed *the Eighth day*, it is not meant of an Eighth day in Courſe from the *Creation*; but, *the Eighth day* from *the Birth*. And in like manner *Ex.* 12. 16. *In the Seventh day there ſhall be a Holy Convocation*; it is not meant of the *Seventh day of the Week* from the Creation; but on the Seventh day of the *Feaſt of unleavened Bread*, what ever day of the Week that happen to be. And

Exod. 16. 5, 25. The *Sixth* and *Seventh* day there mentioned, ſeem plainly to be, not the Sixth and Seventh in courſe *from the Creation* (which I doubt was not then known) but from the *firſt raining of Manna*, ver. 4, 5.

He'll ſay perhaps, The Jews obſerved ſuch *Seventh* day from the *Creation*, and that was their *Sabbath*. But that is more than he or I know, or any man living. They had I grant, a Circulation of *Seven days*, but from what *Epocha* we cannot tell. And when *Moſes* tells them (on the *Sixth* day) *Ex.* 16. 23. *To morrow is the Reſt of the Holy Sabbath.* It ſeems to be the fixing of a new *Epocha* (from the firſt raining of *Manna*) and then all his Arguments, from the continual Obſervation of the Seventh day from the Creation till that time, are at an end. Whether this (from the firſt raining of *Manna*) be the ſame with that from the Creation; no man can tell. And there is *Six to One* odds that it is not.

Now, that there is a new Courſe of Sabbath (from a new beginning) whereof this Seventh day from the firſt raining of Manna is the Firſt, and not a continuation of a former Courſe hitherto obſerved without interruption; ſeems farther evident from this conſideration, Becauſe, if this were but a continuation of that uninterrupted Courſe of Sabbaths, then the next Seventh day before it, would have been a Sabbath alſo, and to have been in like manner obſerved; that is, the next day before the firſt raining of *Manna*. Bnt, on that day we find (*Exod.* 16. 12, 13.) *the Quails came up and covered the Camp*, without any Prohibition to gather them. If therefore they might not (now) gather *Manna*, becauſe it was the *Sabbath*; but *might* (before) gather *Quails*; it ſhould ſeem, that was *not* a *Sabbath*.

And if it be not allowed, upon occaſion, to fix a new *Epocha*; then if the Circulation of Weeks from the beginning of the World (which was then about 2500 years old) did ever chance to have been interrupted, and the day forgotten, (as in all likelyhood it might be in *Egypt*, if not long before) or if ever after it ſhould chance ſo to be (as in the days of *Joſiah* when *the Book of the Law* was loſt, and the *Paſs-over* forgotten;) men muſt never keep a Sabbath thenceforth. For then all his own Arguments return upon him; No *other* day is *Commanded* ('tis Will-worſhip,) no *Promiſe* to the Obſervance, no *Threatning* for the Neglect.

I ſhould rather think, if that day were unknown (as I believe it is) *Any* day were better than *None* at all. For Gods Commands do more reſpect the Subſtance of the Duty than the Circumſtance

ſtance of Time, eſpecially if they cannot both be had.

Circumciſion was to be Adminiſtred on the *Eighth* day, according to the Inſtitution, (I do not mean the *Eighth day of the Week*, but the *Eighth day of the Childs Age*; and therefore on the ſame day of the Week on which the Child was Born.) But if by Accident or Default it were omitted, it might be done any day after, rather than not at all. *Abraham* we know was 99 years old, and *Iſmael* 13 when they were Circumciſed, (and what was the Age of other Males in *Abraham*'s Family, we cannot tell;) and a Proſelyte, at any Age, was to be Circumciſed; (though perhaps it were not remembred on what day of the Week he was Born;) and thoſe who were born in the Wilderneſs for Forty years together, were all Circumciſed at once, *Joſh.* 5. 4, 5, 9. (though not all born on the ſame day of the Week.)

The Paſs-over was appointed to be eaten ſtanding, with their Loyns girt, their Shoes on their feet, and their Staffs in their hand, as in haſt to be gone *Ex.* 12. Yet our Saviour ſeemeth to have Eaten it Sitting, or rather Lying. And *none of them were to ſtir out of doors till morning*, Ex. 12. 22. Yet Chriſt and his Diſciples went out the ſame night to *the mount of Olives*, and thence to *Gethſemane*, Mat. 26. 30, 36.

The Shew-bread was to be eaten by the Prieſts only: yet our Saviour obſerves that *David* did eat of it (on a ſpecial occaſion) without blaming him for ſo doing.

The *Rechabites* are commended *Jer.* 31. for obeying the Command of *Jonathan* their Father, *not to drink Wine, nor build Houſes, but to dwell in Tents* &c. Yet did they, upon *Nebuchadnezzar*'s Invaſion, quit their *Tents* and repair to *Jeruſalem*; nor is it reputed a Diſobedience.

The *Paſchal Lamb* was to be kill'd the *Fourteenth day of the Firſt Month at Evening*: Yet if we conſider how little knowledge they had in thoſe days, of the Sun and Moons motions, and if we conſider what the Jewiſh Writers tell us of their very uncertain Method of judging, which was the *Firſt Month*, and which the *Fourteenth day* of that Month we ſhall find they were at great uncertainties, as to the juſt day; yet was not the Service thereof to be neglected, upon pretenſe there was danger of miſſing the right day.

For they had not Almanacks in thoſe days, as we have now, to tell us before hand when will be a New Moon. But (if we may believe the Jewiſh Writers) their manner was, about the time when they expected a New-Moon, to ſend men to watch for it on

the Top of ſome Hill or high Place; and he who could firſt diſcover a New-Moon, was to tell the Prieſt, and he to *blow the Trumpet* to give the People notice that there was a New-Moon, (much like our Cuſtom at *Oxford*, at the time of the *Aſſizes*, to ſet ſome on St. *Maries* Steeple to watch when the Judges are coming, and then to Ring the *Great Bell* to give notice to thoſe concerned, that the Judges are at hand;) But, in caſe of Cloudy Weather, if in three days time from their firſt Expectation no man could ſee a New Moon, they did then venture (but not before) to blow the Trumpet without ſeeing it, which muſt needs cauſe a great uncertainty; and the ſame Moon ſooner ſeen at one place than at another, and the Paſs-over kept accordingly. And tis manifeſt in the Story of our Saviours laſt Paſſ-over, that he kept it on one day and the Jews on another (perhaps he about a Fortnight before, might ſee a New-Moon, a day ſooner than they did.) So great uncertainty there was at that time, as to the particular day, though the Inſtitution was punctual for the *Fourteenth* day of the *Firſt* Month. And the like uncertainty there was as to all their *Feaſts* of *New-Moons*.

And even in our days, when the Motions of the Sun and Moon are much better known than at that time they were, we are far from being exact in point of time. Our Rule for *Eaſter* is much the ſame with theirs for the *Paſs-over*; The Rule in general is this, *The Sunday next after the Fourteenth day of the Firſt Month, is to be Eaſter day.* But when we come to make particular application, we do ſtrangely miſs of our Rule. And our Paſchal Tables which ſhould direct us, do put us farther out than if we had none at all.

For (by reaſon that we take the length of our common year a little too long, by about Eleven minutes of an hour, and the length of our Months too long alſo;) ſince the time that thoſe Tables were made, 'tis well known that the beginning of our Eccleſiaſtical Firſt Month, is Ten or Eleven days later than that of the Heavens; and our Eccleſiaſtical New-Moons and Full-Moons, is later by Four or Five days than thoſe of the Heavens. Whereby we do very often miſtake the *Month*, and yet oftner the true *Week*, for keeping of *Eaſter*. And though Pope *Gregory* the Eighth, did (ſomewhat more than an Hundred years ago) ſomewhat rectify the Calendar, yet both Papiſts and Proteſtants do obſerve, ſome the Newer *Gregorian*, and ſome the Older *Julian* account, and (in the United Proviuces of the *Netherlands*) one Town obſerves one account, and the next the other account, and

and accordingly keep their Eaſters (if at all) at Three, Four or Five Weeks diſtance,

And ſo for Chriſtmas-day. 'Tis not agreed amongſt Chronologers either what Year, or what Month, much leſs what day of that Month, our Saviour was born, yet wee keep *December 25th.* in memory of his Birth, as ſuppoſing him to have been then born. Yea we are at ſo great uncertainty, that we reckon the year 1692 from his *Circumciſion*, to begin the Firſt of *January*; but the ſame year as from his *Conception*, not till the 25*th* of *March* next following; as if his Birth and Circumciſion had been a quarter of a year before his Conception.

And if we be now at ſo great an uncertainty, in ſo ſhort a Period as from the Birth of Chriſt, I do not think the Jews could be punctual, as to a day, in obſerving their Paſſ-over; and much leſs, as to a day from the Creation of the World.

He'l ſay perhaps, that Eaſter and Chriſtmas being of humane Inſtitution, it is not much matter though we miſs the day, nor much matter perhaps whether it be kept or no. Be it ſo; But the Paſs-over was of Divine Inſtitution; yet were they at a great uncertainty, and might chance to miſs more than a day or two; yet was not the Duty to be therefore neglected. The miſtake of a Day, was of much leſs concernment than the neglect of the Duty; As was the *Tithing of Mint and Anniſe*, than *the weightier things of the Law.* Theſe little Circumſtances are but *Shaddows*, in compariſon of the *Subſtance*, as the Compariſon is *Col.* 2. 17.

Which is not ſaid to incourage any one to violate the Laws of God, even in little things, (for we find God ſometimes very ſevere even in ſuch; as in the Caſe of *Uzzah*'s *touching the Ark*, and *Nadab and Abihu*'s *offering ſtrange Fire;* for Reaſons beſt known to himſelf, of which we are not aware.) But onely to ſhew that the Subſtantials of a Duty are to be regarded more than Circumſtantials; and theſe upon occaſion to give way to thoſe. And in ſuch Caſes (if it were a fault) the Prayer of *Hezekiah* (2 *Chr.* 30. 18.) is to take place, *The good Lord pardon every one that prepareth his heart to ſeek God, though he be not cleanſed according to the Purification of the Sanctuary.* And his Service was accepted, though (as it is expreſly noted) *they did eat the Paſſ-over otherwiſe than as it was written*: And, *in the Second Month*, in ſtead of the *Firſt.*

And doubtleſs in the preſent caſe, If we do not know (as certainly we do not) which is the *Firſt* or *Seventh* day in a continual Circu-

Circulation from the Creation, it is much better to keep a Weekly Sabbath on any day of the Week whatever, than to keep none at all, and much more agreable to the true meaning of the Fourth Commandment.

All which is ſaid, partly by way of Caution, not to be forward, upon ſlight grounds, to diſturb the Peace and ſettled practiſe of the whole Chriſtian Church at this day.

Partly to take off what he would have to be admitted but cannot be proved, that the Seventh day in a continued Circulation of Weeks from the firſt Creation, was obſerved as the Weekly Sabbath, from the Creation to the Floud; from thence to *Abraham*; from thence to *Iſraels* coming out of *Egypt*; and from thence till after the Reſurrection of Chriſt. Which I think is impoſſible for any man to know.

And partly to ſatisfy what he objects from the Fourth Commandment. Which ſaith indeed that there is to be a *Reſt* on the *Seventh day after Six days of Labour*, but not a Word of its being ſuch Seventh day in a continual Circulation of Weeks from the Creation. And therefore we are ſafe hitherto, for ought I ſee.

But I'le come up a little nearer to him. He may perhaps tell us (though I do not find he doth) that the Jews did certainly keep their Weekly Sabbath (at the time of our Saviours death) on what *they* called *the Seventh day*. If not on the Seventh day of the Week from the Creation (of which we can have no certainty) at leſt on the Seventh day of the Week, as the Weeks were *then* reckoned; (which I readily grant him) and that they had ſo done for a long time before, and perhaps from the time of giving the Law on Mount *Sinai*. (And it may be ſo, for ought I know, but we cannot be certain.) And what was then called *the Firſt day of the Week*, was another day from what they called *the Seventh* (which I admit alſo.) And that, what they called *the Seventh day*, is now what we call *Saturday*, and what they called the *Firſt day* is what we now call *Sunday*. But this, I ſay, is more than he or I know. He may think ſo; and ſo do I; but I am not ſure of it.

The reaſon why I think ſo, is, becauſe I think that Chriſt or his Apoſtles (according to Chriſts direction) did remove the obſervation of the Sabbath, from the Seventh to the Firſt day of the Week, and that we have ever ſince kept the Sabbath as they did, (for I do not know that it hath been ſince altered,) and as we now keep it on Sunday, ſo I believe they did; and therefore think that our Sunday is what they called the Firſt day.

And

And if the Apoſtles did then remove it from their Seventh day to their Firſt day, I preſume they had direction from Chriſt ſo to do, who after his Reſurrection, *ſhewed himſelf to them for Fourty days, giving Commandments to his Apoſtles ſpeaking to them of things pertaining to the Kingdom of God*, Acts 1. 2, 3. And therefore, what they did afterwards in ſettling the Chriſtian Church, they did (we are to preſume) according to ſuch Directions and Commandments of Chriſt, and this in particular of ſo removing the Obſervation of the Sabbath day, if they did remove it, (as I think was done) by his Authority who was *Lord of the Sabbath day*. Matth. 12. 8. Luk. 6. 5.

But if they did not ſo remove it; I do not know that it hath ſince been changed. For I think we keep the ſame Sabbath which they did: and that the Chriſtian Church hath ever ſince ſo done; and doth pretend ſo to have done, by a conſtant Tradition ever ſince. And we therefore think our Sunday to be their Firſt day of the Week, becauſe we think their Sabbath ſo to have been. But if we miſtake in that Tradition, we are (for ought I know) accordingly miſtaken in thinking Sunday to be their Firſt day; (For we have nothing but Tradition for either.) And then for ought he can ſhew (by better than Tradition) to the Contrary, our Sunday may be their Seventh day. And then he hath no pretenſe to quarel with it.

If he ſay the Jews do at this day keep Saturday as their Seventh day. I confeſs they do. But they do no more know which is the Seventh day; than we, which is the Firſt day. And becauſe they find that Chriſtians generally take Sunday to be what was before called the Firſt day, they do accordingly take Saturday to be their Seventh day. But their Tradition is of no greater Authority than ours. All depending upon this, that our Sunday being that Sabbath which we think Chriſt or his Appoſtles did appoint, we take it to be the Firſt day, becauſe Chriſt or his Apoſtles (by Chriſts directions) did remove the obſervation of the Sabbath to that day.

He'l ſay perhaps; I do not my ſelf think our Sunday to be their Seventh day. And then, why ſhould not our Sabbath be on Saturday as theirs was?

'Tis true, I do not think our Sunday to be their Seventh day. And I have told you the reaſon why I do not think it; Becauſe I think Chriſt or his Apoſtles did change the day, and for that reaſon only. And for the ſame reaſon I think our Sabbath ſhould be as now it is, and as I think it hath been ever ſince. But if I be miſtaken

miſtaken in it, I may be miſtaken in the other alſo: But, either way, Sunday is yet to be our Sabbath.

He ſays, It is no where *expreſly ſaid in Scripture*, that the Apoſtles did thus change it. True, and 'tis no where ſaid in Scripture, that our Sunday is not their Seventh day. It may be the ſame for ought I know, (and for ought he knows) if it were not then changed. Though, becauſe I think the day was then changed, I do therefore think it is not the ſame. And if it were not changed, then all the difference is, that what they called the Seventh day of their Week, we call the Firſt day of our Week. Which, if the Author do not like, he may call Monday the Firſt day, and then Sunday will be the Seventh, as it was before.

But I ſay further; There be many things, even as to the Worſhip of God, which we may reaſonably think to have *been done*, though it be not *expreſly ſaid ſo*; but only to be collected by conſequence from what is ſaid.

'Tis no where ſaid expreſly, that, after the Firſt Sabbath of God himſelf, (*Gen.* 2. 2.) any other Sabbath was ever kept before that in *Exod.* 16. which was above Two Thouſand and Five Hundred Years after. Yet this Author would have us think it was *obſerved* all that while; and that it was *commanded* ſo to be, which yet is no where ſaid expreſly. But a ſlight preſumption, it ſeems, may ſerve his turn, but not ours.

'Tis known that God was Worſhiped by *Sacrifices* very early; at leaſt as early, as that of *Cain* and *Abel*; and that this Worſhip was accepted of God, at leaſt that of *Abel*. And therefore I ſuppoſe this Author would have us think it was *Commanded*. (not a meer *Will-worſhip*, without any Direction or Inſtitution from God.) Yet we are no where told, of any ſuch Command or Inſtitution.

We may ſay the like of *Jacob*'s conſecrating a *Pillar*, by *pouring Oyl* upon it, *Gen.* 28. 18. though we do not find mention, before that time, of any direction for any ſuch *Conſecration* (of things or perſons) by *Anointing*, or *Pouring on of Oyl*.

We have alſo reaſon to think there was ſome Command from God, that the Fire for *Incenſe* ſhould be taken from the *Altar*, (or ſomewhat of like nature;) elſe *Nadab* and *Abihu* would not have been deſtroyed for *Offering ſtrange Fire*. Yet we are no where told expreſly of any ſuch Command.

We have no particular Command (that I know of) for Baptizing of Infants, nor any particular mention in Scripture of any ſuch Baptized. Yet I do not know that this Author would have

have us thence infer, that none such were baptized, or that they ought not so to be.

Nor have we any express mention of *Women* receiving the other Sacrament; nor any express Command for their so doing (any more than for Females being Circumcised) yet I know not any who doth therefore think they ought not.

We know that Children were reputed Members of the Church of God before Christ's coming; and we have no reason to think that Christ did put them out (and make them in a worse condition than they were before) but rather would have them continue so to be; and seems to favour it, by that of *suffer little Children to come to me and forbid them not; for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven* Mar. 10. 14. and did accordingly *embrace them* as such. And therefore, as (*before*) they were *Circumcised*, (which was *then* the Sacrament of Admission;) So they should (*now*) be *Baptized*, which is *our* Sacrament of Admission.) And when we find whole *Families* to be Baptized, we cannot think but that there might be *little Children* in some of them; (and more likely so than otherwise.) And we are, in such cases, to practise according to what we may judge by what we find. We find also that *Women* were *Baptized* (though not *Circumcised* in the Jewish Church,) yet we have no *Command* for so doing. And because there seems to be the same reason for *Women* receiving the other Sacrament as for *Men*, (and we find nothing to the contrary,) therefore we do now practise it (as the most likely to be God's Will, according to the Light we now have) though we find in Scripture neither express Precept nor Example for it.

In like manner it is no Argument that Christ or his Apostles did not make such a change, because *in Scripture* it is not *expressly* said so. 'Tis enough if we there find so much as that we may thence reasonably judge they did so; and more likely so than not.

Now I meet with so much there to that purpose, as makes me judge they did. And so much as (I believe) would make this Gentleman so to think, if he were not otherwise prepossessed with prejudice; and with a great fondness to find out somewhat wherewith to find fault.

I find that Christ, on the very day of his Resurrection (which was the *First day of their Week*) did not only appear to the good *Women* at the Sepulchre (who sought him there) and declare to them the *Resurrection* (which was then to *Preach* a new Doctrine, of which they were not before aware) and *bid them* tell it to his Disciples. But did also the same day himself declare it to

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CAMBRIDGE

Two of them going to *Emmaus* (*Luk.* 24.) *Preaching* to them, from *Moſes and the Prophets* ver. 25, 26, 27. the Doctrine of his *Death and Reſurrection* (which was to them a new Doctrine, which till then they did not underſtand,) or (as the Phraſe there is) did *Expound to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himſelf* ver. 27. which I think, was *Preaching*, and did *open to them the Scriptures* (ver. 32.) concerning thoſe points; (which was a Sabbath-days exerciſe, though perhaps they did not at firſt ſo apprehend it) and did, I take it, celebrate with them the Sacrament of the *Lords Supper* (and perhaps the firſt time after the firſt Inſtitution) for ſo much ſeems to be implyed in thoſe words, (ver. 30.) *he took bread and bleſſed it, and brake, and gave to them*, and (ver. 35.) *he was known to them by breaking of Bread*, (for that Sacrament uſed to be deſigned by *breaking of Bread*.) And if our Author could but ſhew ſo much as this, once done, in the firſt 2500 years from the Creation, on the Seventh day, it would be a better proof for the Celebration of the *Seventh-day Sabbath* in that time, than all that he offers at to that purpoſe. And the *Effect* of this *Preaching* was on them ſo much, that *their eyes were opened, and their heart did burn within them, while he talked with them by the way, and opened to them the Scriptures*, ver. 31, 32. and they returned preſently (the ſame hour) to *Jeruſalem*, to acquaint the Diſciples (who were there aſſembled) with this good news.

If he tell us that this Journey from *Jeruſalem* to *Emmaus* (being about *Threeſcore Furlongs*, near Eight of our Miles) and back again, was more than a *Sabbath-days Journey*; I confeſs it was (unleſs upon an urgent occaſion) if they had known it to be a *Sabbath-day*, when they *undertook the Journey*; but this then they knew not; nor was it therefore, on this occaſion, a breach of the Sabbath ſo to do.

If he ſay, *Chriſt* knew it (though they did not) if it were now a Sabbath. 'Tis true; he did ſo. But Chriſt, I preſume, in that eſtate (after his Reſurrection) could *Travel* without *Pain*, and therefore without breaking the Sabbath. Or if it were painful; he tells us *Mat.* 12. 5, *that the Prieſts in the Temple profane the Sabbath and are blameleſs*; that is, they take as much pains or labour in killing, dreſſing, and offering the Sacrifices, as a Butcher would do in killing and dreſſing his meat; which would in the Butcher be a culpable Profanation of the Sabbath; but is not ſo in the Prieſts, becauſe theirs is *Religious Service*. Nor doth this Author think that in *Preaching*, though it be a *Labour*, the Miniſter doth thereby break the Sabbath. And ſuch was Chriſts

im-

imployment here. And, then, whether he Preach Standing, or Preach Walking, 'tis all one.

And if he say farther, that the Disciples at *Jerusalem* (not then knowing this) could not be thought then to have met upon a *Sabbatical* account: I grant this also, that their then meeting was Providential (as was that of the Two other meeting Christ in their Journey;) yet they might before they parted (as did those others) know more of it than at their first coming together. And Christ knew before what he meant to do, though they did not, and did accordingly so order it by his Providence. And though they did not know that it was thenceforth to be kept as a *Sabbath*, yet may they well be supposed to be imployed on *Religious Work*, upon what Tidings the *Women* had before brought them (of Christs being *Risen*) waiting for what directions they should farther receive from Christ.

To this purpose let us consider what was further done at this meeting. While these Two were telling the rest what had happened to them; *As they thus spake* (ver. 36.) *Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and said Peace be unto you*: And did (*by shewing them his hands, and feet*, and their *handling of them*, and seeing him *eat before them*) convince them that he was *indeed Risen from the Dead*, and that it was not only a *Spirit* that appeared to them (*ver.* 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42.) And did again, to them, *Preach* the same Doctrine which he had before preached to the Two; That it was what *he had told them while he was yet with them* (though they did not understand it,) That this was but *what was written in the Law of Moses, and the Prophets, and the Psalms concerning him*; and *opened their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures*; That it *was thus written, that it behoved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the Third day; and that Repentance and Remission of Sins was to be Preached in his Name among all Nations*; *whereof they were to be his Witnesses*, and *Apostles* (ver. 44, 45, 46, 47, 48.) And did renew his *Promise* of sending the *Holy Ghost*, and *Power from on high* (*v.* 49.) He did moreover at the same meeting, not only *upbraid them for their unbelief*, (Mark 16. 14.) but did Authorize them with a solemn *Commission* for the Work they were to be sent about, to *Go into all the World, and Preach the Gospel to every Creature; that he who believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he who believeth not shall be damned*; (ver. 15, 16.) and a Power to work *Miracles* (ver. 17, 18.) in confirmation of that Doctrine.

And to the same purpose, *John* 20. 19. *The same day at Evening*

(in which he before appeared to *Mary Magdalen* and the reſt) *being the Firſt day of the Week* (the very day of his Reſurrection) *where the Diſciples were aſſembled* (at a private meeting) *for fear of the Jews* (*the door being ſhut*) *Jeſus came and ſtood in the midſt of them*, and gave them his Solemn Benediction, *ſaying unto them, Peace be unto you*; And in Confirmation of his Reſurrection, *ſhewed them his hands and his ſide*; (ver. 20.) And then a *Second* time gives them his Solemn *Bleſſing* together with his *Ordination* or *Commiſſion* for Preaching the Goſpel, and Planting the Chriſtian Church, *Jeſus ſaith to them Again, Peace be unto you; As my Father hath ſent me, even ſo ſend I you. And when he had ſaid this, he breathed upon them and ſaid unto them, Receive the Holy Ghoſt: Whoſe ſoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted to them; and whoſe ſoever Sins ye retain, they are retained*, ver. 21, 22, 23.

All which being put together, ſeems to me very like the *Celebration* (if not the *Conſecration*) of a Chriſtian *Sabbath*, or day of *Holy Reſt* and Religious Service. 'Tis all of it *Sabbatical Work*, and there is a great deal of it.

'Tis not indeed *expreſly ſaid*, That he did *bid* them thus to meet on ſuch other *Firſt day* of the Week, (as neither is it expreſly ſaid, *Gen.* 2. 3. that God did then *bid Adam* and *Eve* to keep a Weekly *Sabbath*, or that he did *bid* them to offer *Sacrifice*;) but it is very likely Chriſt might ſo order it (and more likely than that he did not.) For, that they did ſo meet we are ſure; and therefore 'tis very likely (if not a ſtrong preſumption) that they were *bid* ſo to do. For ſo we find it *Joh.* 20. 26. *After Eight days* (that is, as we commonly ſpeak in Engliſh, *on that day Sennight*) *his Diſciples were again within, and* Thomas *with them* (who before was abſent) *the door being ſhut; then Jeſus came and ſtood in the midſt and ſaid Peace be unto you*, (as he had done the Week before,) and ſatisfyed *Thomas*, who before doubted.

So that we have here Two Solemn meetings of the Diſciples, Two Weeks together (the Two firſt after his Reſurrection) on the *Firſt day of the Week*; and Chriſt with them on both. (And I am ſure we have not more for the Firſt Sabbath, *Gen.* 2. 3.) Of how many more ſuch Sabbaths he ſo met with them, I cannot tell. That he oft appeared to them (during the Forty days of his abode on Earth after his Reſurrection) we cannot doubt, and its like it might be on theſe days.

The Cavil which here he makes to this place, is ſo weak, that I am ſorry to ſee it from one who would ſeem to be ſerious. As if *Eight days after*, or *after Eight days*, were not the ſame as what

we

we would say *a Week after* or that day *Sennight after*. For he must needs know, that 'tis not only the Common Scripture Language, but the general Language of Latine and Greek Writers, to reckon *Inclusively*; that is, to take in both the extreams; and so it is even at this day (I think) in most Languages except English. What we call a *Sennight*, the French call *huict jours* (Eight days) and what we say a *Fortnight*, is with them *Quinze jours* (Fifteen days;) and so in all manner of reckoning. A *Fourth*, a *Fifth*, an *Eighth*, a *Fifteenth*, and other *Intervals* in *Muſick* are always ſo reckoned. What we call a *Third-day-Ague*, the Latins call a *Quartan*; and what we call *every other day*, they call a *Tertian*. So they call *Secundo Calendas* (i.e. *Secundo die ante Calendas*) what we would ſay *one day* (not *two days*) *before the Calends*; and they call *tertio Calendas*, what is with us *two days* (not *three days*) *before the Calends*. So *nudius tertius* is what we would ſay *two days ago*; and *nudius quartus* is in our Language *Three days ago* (not *Four*.) So *Mark* 8. 31. where Chriſt ſpeaks of himſelf, that *the Son of Man ſhould be killed and after three days riſe again*, that is, *on the Third day after* (inclusively taken) or *after the Third day is come*; whereas, according to the ſenſe this Author would put upon the words, it ſhould rather have been ſaid *after one day* (for there was but *one* day *between* his Death and Reſurrection.) And it is the ſame in ſenſe, with what he ſays *Joh.* 2. 19. *Deſtroy this Temple*, (ſpeaking of his Body) *And in Three days I will raiſe it up*, ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις, or as *Mat.* 26. 61. ἐν τρισὶ ἡμέραις, that is, *the Third day after* (inclusively.) And *Mat.* 27. 63. they tell *Pilate*, *This Deceiver ſaid, After Three days I will riſe again*, μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας (meaning thereby *the Third day after, inclusively*,) and therefore they pray, that the Sepulchre may be made ſure *till the Third day*. Whereas if (as our Author would reckon *upon his fingers*) by *after Three days*, were to be underſtood, when *Three whole days* after that ſhould be paſt, they need not ſet their Watch before the *Fourth* or *Fifth* day. Thus Chriſt's *Aſcenſion* is ſaid to be *Forty* days after his *Reſurrection*, (ſpeaking of a Scripture Computation in Scripture Language,) which in our ordinary manner of Speech is but *Nine and Thirty*. For *Aſcenſion-Thurſday* (if *Eaſter-day* be now reckoned for one) is but 39 days *after* Eaſter. Upon a like Account that Chriſt tells us *Mat.* 12. 40. that as *Jonas was three days and three nights in the Whales Belly, ſo ſhall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the Earth*. Not Three *whole days*, and Three *whole nights*; but, till *the Third* was begun. For by

day

day and night is here understood the νυχθήμερον, or what we now call the *artificial day*, consisting of 24 hours, day and night: and till such Third day (or τριήμερον) was begun, Christ rested in the Grave; otherwise, though he were in the Grave (part of) *Three days*, yet but *Two nights*.

So *Luke* 2. 21. *When Eight days were accomplished* (*for the Circumcision of the Child*) *they called his name Jesus*; that is, *upon the Eighth day, inclusively*; reckoning the day of Birth for the first, and the day of Circumcision for the last (of the Eight days) which with Six whole days between make Eight. (Whereas, if Eight *whole days* had been *fully* past, Christ had been Circumcised the *Tenth* day.) The Sense being the same with that concerning *John the Baptist*, Luk 1. 59. *On the Eighth day they came to Circumcise the Child*. So here, *After Eight days*, that is *on the Eighth day*, or *after the Eighth day was come*. And this, I think, is the constant Language of Scripture every where. And his Objection needs no other Answer, but, *that St.* John *did not speak English*.

And I cannot but think (however he please thus to object) that himself doth believe this, *after Eight days*, to be here meant of the *First day* of the next Week, (and he should have been so candid as to own it.) And that *post Octo dies* is the same in sense with *Octo post diebus*, that is, *the Eighth day after*, (*reckoning the present day for one*,) and that it is so to be understood in this place. We should not, in a serious *Enquiry*, press what *possibly might* be, but what we truly think *is* the meaning. A Lawyer at the Bar may fairly propose *For* his Client, what *possibly may* be the Sense of such or such a Clause. But a Judge on the Bench (and a Counsellor, *To* his Client,) is to consider what *really Is* the Sense of Words in question. I dare appeal to himself, whether (in his own thoughts) he do not think *after Eight days*, here to signifie the same, as *after Eight days were accomplished*, Luk 2. 21. And, if so, then this is rather *to Wrangle*, than *to Dispute fairly*.

Before I dismiss this place, it is not amiss to take more particular notice about what time it was that *Mary Magdalen* and the other Women came to the Sepulchre on the day of Christs Resurrection. 'Tis said *Luke* 23. 55, 56. *When they beheld the Sepulchre and how the body was laid*, (on the sixth day day at night whereon he was Crucified) *they returned and prepared Spices and Ointments, and rested the Sabbath day according to the Commandment*. And in the next words *Luk.* 24. 1. *Now upon the First day of the Week, very early in the morning, they came to the Sepulchre*

Sepulchre bringing the Spices which they had prepared. In *Mat.* 28. 1. *In the end of the Sabbath when it began to dawn toward the First day of the week.* In *Mark* 16. 1. *When the Sabbath was past, very early in the morning the First day of the Week, they came to the Sepulchre at the rising of the Sun,* or *by Sun-rising.* And *Joh.* 20. 1. *The First day of the Week, early, when it was yet dark, they came to the Sepulchre.* (Perhaps all the Women did not come just at the same time, but were all there by Sun-rising.) But the Body was raised before they came, as is agreed by all the Evangelists.

Where I observe First that the Sabbath, according to their Account, did not end till toward the morning of the next day. The *end of the Sabbath*, or when *the Sabbath was past*, was *early in the morning, before the Sun-rising*, while *the day did begin to dawn*, and while it *was yet dark*. Very *early* indeed in the morning, but yet not till *morning*, (not in the Evening over night.) And therefore (without disputing how the day was reputed to begin in the time of *Moses*) 'tis manifest that, at this time, as well the Sabbath as other days was by them reckoned not from (the beginning of) the Evening to (the beginning of) the Evening, but rather (according to the Rom. account) from Midnight to Midnight.

For 'tis manifest that it was toward Evening of the Sixth day before the Crucifixion was over; For it was some while *after the Ninth hour* (that is, after our Three a Clock) that *he cryed with a loud voice and gave up the Ghost*, Mark 15. 34, 37. And it was yet later, when they *brake the Legs of the two Thieves*, (that they might not remain on the Cross upon the Sabbath) but only *pierced his side*, because he was *already dead*, Joh. 19. 31, 32, 33, 34. And later yet when *Joseph* of *Arimathea* begged his Body and buried it. For 'tis expresly said, *When Even was come there came a rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, and begged the body of Jesus, and when he had taken the Body, he wrapped it in a clean linnen Cloth and buried it in his own new Tomb*, Mat. 27. 57, 58, 59, 60. Mark 15. 42, 43, 44, 45, 46. Luk. 23. 51, 52, 53.

But, though *Even were come* before this time, yet the *Sabbath was not begun*, for so it followeth, *Luk.* 23. 54. *that day was the Preparation and the Sabbath drew on.*

And after this, *ver.* 55, 56. *the Women who beheld the Sepulchre, and how the Body was laid, returned and prepared Spices and Ointments* (the same night) but *rested the Sabbath day according to the Commandment.* And by this time it must needs be pretty late at night; while yet the Sabbath was not begun. That is, I suppose not till Midnight of the Sixth day.

Nor

Nor was the Sabbath ended when Evening began on the Seventh day. For if so, the Women might that night have *brought* and applyed their *Spices and Ointments* which they *had prepared* the night before. For they had as much time so to do, after the Evening was begun that night (if the Sabbath were now ended) as they had, to do what was done the night before; after that Evening was then begun. Nothing hindered them but because the Sabbath was not yet done, and they were to *rest the Sabbath day according to the Commandment*. But, so soon as well they could, *when the Sabbath was ended*, they came *early*, the next *morning*, while it *was yet dark*. And might as well have come the night before, if the Sabbath had ended when the evening began.

I add farther, If the Sabbath had ended at the evening of the Seventh day, and the First day of the Week had then begun (as this Author would have it,) Christ might have risen that night (for it would then have been the *Third day*,) and not have stay'd in the grave (for the third day) till the next morning, which yet we know he did.

'Tis manifest therefore, that the First day of the Week did begin from the middle of the night, not from the First Evening of the Seventh day. And that Christ was risen *very early in the morning* of that *First day* while it was yet dark.

We are next to Consider how long that First day lasted. After Christ was risen *early* in the morning while it was yet *dark*, (how early that was, we cannot tell, but it was *in the Morning*, not over night;) he appeared first to *Mary Magdalen*, and the Women who went to the Sepulchre; they, as they were directed, carried news of it to the Disciples; and *when they were going*, (Mat. 28. 11.) *the Watch came into the City and shewed to the High-Priests the things which were done; who, taking a Counsel, gave the Souldiers Money to say, His Disciples came and stole him away while they were asleep*; undertaking to *secure them* in case the *Governour* should come to hear it.

Upon this news being brought by the Women to the Disciples, Two of them, from the rest, went to the Sepulchre to enquire into the business; and brought an account of it to the rest, who were Astonished at it.

And all this happened before the Two Disciples began their Journey to *Emmaus*; for they discoursed of it by the way, and told it to *Jesus* who fell into their Company. *Luk* 24. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24. Now their Journey from *Jerusalem* to *Emmaus*, was *about Threescore Furlongs*, ver. 13. which our Author rightly computes

putes to be about *Seven miles and an half*, of our miles; which they Travelled *on foot*, for 'tis said *they walked*, (Mark 16. 12.) and *Jesus* in their company, Preaching to them (out of *Moses and the Prophets*) the Doctrine of Christ's Death and Resurrection.

When they came near to *Emmaus* it was *towards Evening, and the day far spent*, (Luk. 24. 29.) they did there abide for some time, and *Jesus* with them, continuing to Preach on the same Subject, and was at length known to them by *breaking of Bread*, ver. 30. 35. After which they returned to *Jerusalem* and *told* these things to the *Disciples then gathered together*, ver. 33. By which time (having now *walked* another *Seven miles and an half*) we may reasonably suppose it to be pretty late at night; For, when they first approached to *Emmaus* it was then so late, as that it was not thought convenient (unless upon some such great occasion) to Travel further, *ver.* 28.

Yet, after they were come back to *Jerusalem*, Christ then appeared himself to the Disciples, *blessing* them, *reproaching their unbelief*, *confirming* their *Faith*, giving them *Instructions*, and *Commission for Preaching the Gospel, and Planting the Christian Church*. And it was yet but *the same day at evening, being the First day of the Week*, (Joh. 20. 19.) on which he rose: but now late at night, *when the doors were shut*; that is, (if I mistake not) so late as that it was time to shut up doors, as men use to do towards bed-time. Not as if Christ came in through the Key-hole (any more than did the Two Disciples that came from *Emmaus*) or did Penetrate the doors, (as the Papists would have us think in favour of their *Transubstantiation*;) For they were not so shut but that they could be opened again (upon occasion) to let him in (as they had been to let in those Two that came from *Emmaus*) as well as to let in *Peter* (late at night) *Act.* 12. 16.

So that from *very early* in the *Morning* while it was *dark*, till very *late night* and about *Mid-night*, was the *same day*, viz. the *first day of the Week*. 'Tis manifest therefore that about our Saviours time, according to the Computation of the New Testament, both the Jews and the Four Evangelists did reckon their days from mid-night to mid-night. And if they did not so reckon, Christ could not be said (*Mat.* 12. 40.) to *be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth*. For it was *Evening*, when *Joseph begged* the Body of *Jesus*, and later yet before he *had buried* it, and yet this must be reckoned *part of the Sixth day*; else he had not been *three days* in the *Grave*, or *heart of the earth*.

And I think they were so reckoned in the times of the Old Te-

ſtament alſo. Which though it be not ſo much to the preſent purpoſe, yet (if you will pardon this digreſſion) I will tell you why I think ſo. It is I know an Opinion taken up by ſome, and I find it is grown pretty current even amongſt Learned men) that the Jews in the time of the Old Teſtament did reckon their days from Evening to Evening (whether they mean from Sun-ſet to Sun-ſet, or from Six a Clock to Six a Clock, I cannot tell, nor perhaps are they all agreed as to that point.) But I take it to be a miſtake; which being at firſt taken up without ſufficient ground, hath ſince paſſed (without further examination) from hand to hand.

We find *Exod.* 12. 6. the Paſs-over was to be killed in the Firſt month, on *the Fourteenth day in the Evening*; which I think is agreed by all to be the Evening at the end of the Fourteenth day, (not that at the end of the Thirteenth,) for the next morning was the Fifteenth day; which evening therefore belonged to the Fourteenth day.

But it is noted in the Margin of our Bibles, that it is, in the Hebrew, *between the two Evenings*. You'l ask perhaps, what are thoſe *two Evenings*? I'le tell you what I think they are.

The word *Day*, you know, is taken in a double ſenſe. Sometimes for (what we call) the *Natural* day (as it is contradiſtinguiſhed to night) from Sun-riſing to Sun-ſetting: ſometimes for (what we call) the *Artificial* day (or νυχθήμερον) ſo as to take in both day and night. Our Saviour tells us *there are Twelve hours in the day*; meaning the *Natural* day. But in the *Artificial* day (of which we are now ſpeaking) there be *Four and Twenty* hours. Some pleaſe to call that the *Natural* day, which I call the *Artificial* (for all do not uſe the words in the ſame ſenſe) But that matters not, ſo long as we underſtand one another.

Now by the word *Evening* is underſtood *the end of the day*. Which, as to the *Natural* day, is at *Sun-ſet*; but as to the *Artificial* day, it is (I think) at *Mid-night*. And conſequently, *between the two Evenings*, is as much as to ſay, *after Sun-ſet, and before Mid-night*. And this is what, in our Language, we commonly call *the Evening*, which is in the Hebrew *between the two Evenings*, (that is, between the *end* of the *Natural* day, and the *end* of the *Artificial* day:) and within this time was the Paſs-over to be *Killed*, *Roſted* and *Eaten*; *Nothing of it was to remain till the Morning*; that is, not after *Mid-night*; for as ſoon as *Mid-night* is paſt *Morning* begins. And within this time all *Leaven* was to be put away; that is before the Mid-night of the Fourteenth day. Which is ſo fair an account of it, as that we

need

need not scruple to embrace it. And it was the *Fifteenth* day, that was *the first day* of the *Feast of Unleavened bread*, (all *Leven* being put away before Mid-night,) and this Fifteenth day was to be kept as a *Sabbath*, and a *Holy Feast to the Lord*, ver. 24. (on what ever day of the Week it chanced to fall.) And so was the *One and Twentieth* day, which was the last of those Seven days: *Seven days shall ye eat Unleavened bread, even the first day ye shall put away leaven out of your houses. And in the First day there shall be an Holy Convocation, and in the Seventh day there shall be an Holy Convocation: no manner of Work shall be done in them, save that which every man shall eat*, (that is they are to be kept as a *Sabbath* or day of *Holy Rest*;) ver. 15, 16. From the *Fourteenth day at evening* till the *One and Twentieth day at evening*, ver. 18. that is, from the Fourteenth day at Mid-night, till the One and Twentieth at Mid-night. And in like manner, *Levit.* 23. 32. *from Even to Even*, or Night to Night, that is, from Mid-night to Mid-night; or from the *end of one Evening* to the *end of the next Evening*. So in *Levit.* 23. 5. and *Numb.* 28. 16. *In the Fourteenth day of the First month is the Passover of the Lord; and in the fifteenth day of this month is the feast; Seven days shall unleavened bread be eaten*, &c. Where it is manifest that the *fourteenth* day which is the *Lords Pass-over*, is another day from the *fifteenth* which is the *first day of the Feast*. For *I will pass through the land of* Egypt, (saith God) *this night*, (that is the night of the Fourteenth day) *and will smite all the first born in the land of* Egypt, *Ex.* 12. 12. And what time of the night it was, we are told *ver.* 28. *And it came to pass at Mid-night the Lord smote all the first born of the land of* Egypt. And to the same purpose *Moses* tells *Pharaoh*, chap. 11. 4, 5, 6, 7. *Thus saith the Lord, About Mid-night will I go out into the midst of* Egypt, *And the first born of the land of* Egypt *shall dy, from the first born of* Pharaoh, &c. *that ye may know that the Lord hath put a difference between the* Egyptians *and* Israel. So that the *fourteenth day*, which was the *Lords Pass-over* continued till the *Mid-night* of that day; and then began the *fifteenth day* which was *the first day of the Feast*. Than which I think nothing can be more clear. And *Num.* 33. 3. *The fifteenth day of the first month is the morrow after the Pass-over*. In like manner, *Deut.* 16. 6. *Thou shalt Sacrifice the Pass-over at even, at the going down of the Sun*, (that is, after the going down of the Sun, or when the Sun is gone down) *at the season that thou camest forth out of* Egypt, which was about *Mid-night*, Ex. 12. 41. Ex. 11. 4.

What he offers from *Gen.* 1. 5. is eaſily anſwered. *The evening and the morning were the firſt day*, (and ſo of the other days.) Whence he would have it thought, that the day is to begin at the beginning of the Evening. Or (as the Margin tells us it is in the Hebrew) *the evening was, and the morning was, the firſt day.* Or, *there was evening, and there was morning, day one.* (for in ſuch order the words ſtand in the Hebrew.) Or, *and was evening, and was morning, day one.* That is, there was in the firſt day, (and ſo in the reſt) *evening and morning*, or darkneſs and light. And the Dark is put firſt, becauſe (beginning the day from Mid-night) the dark is before the Light. And by *day one*, is meant *the firſt day.*

And it was moreover very agreable ſo to reckon. For, ſuppoſing Paradiſe the principal ſeat of Action; the Sun may reaſonably be ſuppoſed to be Created (in the middle of the Fourth day, *Gen.* 1. 16.) in the *Meridian* of that place, (as in its greateſt Splendor) or, if not in the Meridian of that place, it muſt needs be in the Meridian of ſome place: and wherever that be, the day (of 24 hours) being there half paſt, it muſt have begun at Mid-night foregoing. And I doubt not but a Child born on *Saturday night at Ten a Clock*, was to be Circumciſed the *next Saturday* (as being the *Eighth day*,) not on the *Sunday after.*

I have inſiſted the longer on this, becauſe I find him afterward moving another queſtion about what time the Sabbath is to *begin* and *end*, and lays great ſtreſs upon it, as we ſhall ſee anon.

Of which I think we need not be further ſolicitous than to begin and end this day, according as other days are accounted to begin and end in the places where we live. I do not think the *Fourth Commandment* to deſcend to theſe *Punctilio's.*

But, if he think it neceſſary to be more curious in it; I take it to be very plain from what I have ſaid, that at the time of Chriſts Death and Reſurrection, it was accounted to begin *very early in the morning*, while it was dark, and continue till *very late at night*, according as we now account our days, from Mid-night to Mid-night. But I go on.

We have now found our Saviours *Example*, as to the two Firſt Sundays from his Reſurrection (if at leaſt their *firſt day of the Week* be our *Sunday*) imploying the day in Religious Exerciſes and Sabbatical Affairs with his Diſciples. How many more Sundays he ſo ſpent with them we cannot tell. Which Examples of his Two firſt, with their Imitation of him in others after, (of which we are to ſpeak by and by,) and the Churches practiſe ever

ſince

since, looks so like the *Celebration* and *Institution* of a Christian Sabbath, or *day of Holy Rest and Religious Exercise*, as that we may warrantably do the like. I am sure it is more than he can shew for the *Saturday Sabbath* in *Gen.* 2. 3. Save that men are apt to think a small thing an *Institution* and *Jus Divinum* for what they fansy; but, as to what they do not, nothing will serve but Full Express Words.

We have next clear Evidence of a like *Practise* (consonant to this *Example*) in *Act.* 20. 7. *On the first day of the Week, when the Disciples came together to break bread, Paul Preached unto them ready to depart on the morrow, and continued his Speech until Mid-night.* Which is so plain that he is much put to his shifts to avoid it. That here is a *Religious Assembly* of the Disciples, he doth not deny; *Paul* was *Preaching* very late, even till Mid-night, and they met to *break bread*, which I think is generally agreed by Interpreters, to signify the Celebration of the *Lords Supper*, and I know not well what clearer Character we need demand of a *Religious meeting for Worship*, sutable to the Work of a *Sabbath* or *Holy Rest*. And it was ἐν τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων, which I think he will not deny (though he seem to cavil at it) to signify, *on the first day of the Week*. But he excepts, that the word διελέγετο here translated *Preached*, is elsewhere render'd *Reasoned* or *Discoursed*. Be it so, and if that word will please him better, let it be so here; he *reasoned, discoursed, treated, or held forth*; that I think will not alter the case; and he continued, or held on (παρέτεινε) this *Discourse*, this *Speech*, this *Sermon* (τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐπὶ πλεῖον) till Mid-night; (he *held on* this *holding forth* till Mid-night) which I take to be the same with what we now call *Preaching*, (or very like it;) 'twas a long continued discourse to a Congregation met together on a Religious account for the Service of God. But let it be called (if he please) a *Religious Discourse* of the Holy *Apostle* to a *Congregation* of *Christians* met together for such a purpose.

He would then have it thought a favour or condescention to *admit* this *breaking of bread*, to be meant of the *Lords Supper*, and not barely a *Common eating*. But since he doth not deny it, we will accept the favour and take it so to be; συνηγμένων ἡμῶν εἰς τὸ κλάσαι ἄρτον, *The Disciples being congregated or assembled to break Bread.* 'Tis ἡμῶν, *The Disciples*; (not *many some* of them;) and they were (perhaps not *every one* but the *generality* of them, as at other meetings) συνηγμένοι *congregated* or *assembled*; and it seems to be a *good full Congregation*, by *Eutychus*'s being mounted to the

third

third loft, (whatever he meant by that *third loft*, though but the *third* ſcaffold,) ſo high that by a fall from thence he was in great danger of being *killed*. Now it is not likely that ſuch a *Congregation* of Chriſtians were thus *aſſembled* for *common eating*.

He ſays, *Paul* was to go away on the Morrow. True. But it is not ſaid they came together to *take leave of Paul*, but came together to *Break Bread*. *Paul's* going away on the Morrow might be the reaſon (and I believe was) why they continued there ſo long: but the *End* for which they came together, was to *Break Bread*: and the *occaſion* of their ſo coming, becauſe it was the *firſt day of the Week*. On which, it ſhould ſeem, they were wont ſo to do for that end. And if he candidly conſider it, methinks it ſhould ſeem ſo to him. *Paul came to them at Troas in five days, where he abode ſeven days: And on the firſt day of the week, when the Diſciples came together to break Bread, Paul preached to them.* Doth not the fair proſpect of the place import thus much, that they were *then* met to break Bread, as being *the firſt day of the week*? What other occaſion was there of mentioning what *day of the Week* it was? It had been otherwiſe a fairer tranſition to have ſaid, *He ſtaid there Seven days, and on the Seventh day* (or the *laſt of thoſe Seven*) *the Diſciples came together to take leave of Paul and Sup with him over night, who was to depart on the morrow.* Now if it had been ſaid *on the Seventh day* (though meaning but the laſt of *thoſe Seven*) it would no doubt have been urged as a great argument of *Paul's* keeping a *Seventh day* Sabbath, and the *Diſciples with him*; not as a *Jewiſh* but as a *Chriſtian* Sabbath, for *breaking of bread* (which was a *Chriſtian* not a *Jewiſh* Service;) For then, *breaking of bread*, would certainly have been the *Lords Supper*. (But becauſe it was *on the firſt day of the Week*) it muſt now be but *common eating*, to *take leave of Paul*, and to *Sup with him*; as (he tells us *p.* 57.) *Friends commonly do* (*when a Miniſter or any other ſpecial Acquaintance intends to take a Journey in the morning*) *to ſup with him over night.* But if he thinks this to be all which is there meant by *the Diſciples coming together on the firſt day of the Week to Break Bread*, he muſt excuſe me if I cannot be of his Opinion.

But becauſe he is content to *admit* (upon ſome terms) their meeting might be upon a *Religious account*, for *the Lords Supper* (as no doubt it was) I ſhall preſs him no further therein: but accept of his condeſcenſion.

When he tells us, that μία is Greek for *one*, and therefore μία σαββάτων may as well be rendered *One day of the Week*, as the *Firſt*

First day of the Week. Surely he is not in earnest. Such trifling doth more hurt than help his cause. No doubt, but when ever they met, it was *one day of the Week*, we need not be told it; and need the word *Week* be added? he might as well have said *one day*; nor need he have said so much. But this Author cannot think (nor doth he) that μία σαββάτων doth any where signify other than the *first* day of the Week. In the whole story of Christs Resurrection, and what followed on that day in all the Four Evangelists, we have no other word for it but μία σαββάτων, nor have we any other word for it (that I know of) there or any where else. I do not know that it is any where called μετὰ τὰ σάββατα. Such shifting doth not look well.

It is somewhat like the Story of a man who *bought a Horse for Five Pounds* to be paid the *next day*. And accordingly on the next day he sent *Five Pounds of Candles*. Perhaps (in the Bargain) it was not said *expressly* (in words at length) *Five Pounds of Lawful Money of England*. But, by common intendment, it must be so understood. And an *honest English Jury*, upon a Tryal, would so *Find* it.

The Latin word *Pridie*, is a Derivative (or Compound rather) from *præ, prior*; and *Postridie* from *post, posterior*; and accordingly (in Latin) *pridie Calendarum*, and *postridie Calendarum* must signify *a day before*, and *a day after* the Calends. But can any man think it is meant of any day? No, but the *next* day *before*, and the *next* day *after*.

So if we say, Christ was Crucified *one* day *before* the Sabbath, and Rose again *one* day *after* the Sabbath. This *one* day is *the next* day. And so any man who hath not a mind to Cavil, will understand it. And so μία σαββάτων, *one day after the Sabbath*, must needs be understood of *the next day after the Sabbath*. Nor is it ever used in any other sense. If it were to be understood of *any* indefinitely, it should be τις *some day* after the Sabbath, not μία *one day* after.

But the most pleasant shift of all, is, when he would have us think that this Evening (which is called the first day of the Week) was *the Evening after the Seventh day*, that is *Saturday night*; and the next morning (when *Paul* was to go away) was *Sunday morning* (and he to travel that Sunday:) And that the *Evening* of *Saturday* was the beginning of *Sunday*, and was therefore called *the First day of the Week*. Because it is said *Gen.* 1. *the evening and the morning was the First day*, (and so of the rest,) and therefore *the evening was the beginning of every day*. See what

what shift a man will make, rather than quit an Opinion he hath once taken up.

We are taught that on *the Fourteenth day of the first month at even* the Pass-over was to be killed. Doth he think that this *Fourteenth day at even* was the *end of the Thirteenth day*, the Fourteenth day then *beginning*? I think every body else takes it to be the evening at the end of the fourteenth day, and the Fifteenth day (on the morrow) was the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread. For though it were the *fourteenth day at evening*, yet it was the *fourteenth day*, not the *fifteenth*.

And *Luke* 23. 54. the evening after our Saviours Crucifixion, on the sixth day, when it was *late at night* (as was shewed before, and must be, according to the story of what had been done before that time) was yet but *the preparation*, not the *Sabbath*, the *Seventh day* being not yet begun. For so we have it, *it was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on.* And the Women were then *preparing their Spices and Oyntments*, yet *rested the Sabbath day according to the Commandment*; So that the Sabbath day was not yet begun; nor was it ended when the evening of the next day began, but on the morning of the day following, as was shewed above.

And (as we shewed at large before) the *first day of the Week* (on which Christ rose) began *very early in the morning while it was dark*, and continued (the *same* day) till *very late at night*. And this is the constant Language of the New Testament every where.

So that when the *Congregation* of Christians, *Acts* 20. 7. *did on the first day of the week* assemble *to break Bread*, and Paul *Preached* to them, continuing his *Sermon* till Mid-night; this must needs be on what we call *Sunday*; and the morning following was *Munday morning*; not *Sunday morning* as this Author would have it.

'Tis manifest therefore, that there was a *Religious Assembly*, of the Christian Congregation at *Troas*, on the *First day of the Week*, for celebration of the *Lords Supper*, and *Preaching*; and *Paul* with them. Which I take to be the celebration of a Christian Sabbath.

However, this (he says) is but *One Instance*. True, this is but one. (But we have heard of more before, and shall hear of more by and by.) But this *one* is more than he can shew for more than *Two Thousand Five Hundred Years* (from God's resting on the Seventh day *Gen.* 2. 3. till after *Israel* was come out of *Egypt* Ex. 16.) during which time he would have us think the Seventh-

day

day Sabbath was constantly observed. And if he could shew any one such instance (of *Enoch*, *Noah*, *Abraham*, or other,) where such a *Religious Assembly*, for the Worship of God, was held on *the seventh day in course from the Creation*; he would think his point well proved, though no more were said of it than is of this. Whereas now as to the time from thence to the Floud, he brings no other proof, but that *Abel*, and *Enoch*, and *Noah* were good men (as no doubt they were) and therefore it is to be presumed *they kept a Sabbath*; and that upon the *seventh day*. Which is to *beg* the question, not to *prove* it.

From thence till *Israels* going into *Egypt*, all that he brings to prove this matter of fact is but that of *Gen.* 13. 6. where (speaking of *Abram* and *Lot*, with the multitude of their Cattel) it is said, *the land was not able to bear them that they might Dwell together; for their substance was great so that they could not Dwell together; and there was a strife between the Herd-men of Abrams Cattle, and the Herd-men of Lots Cattle*, &c. They could not *Dwell* together, that is (saith he) they could not *Rest* together, that is, they could not keep a *Sabbath* together; therefore (he concludes) they did *use* to keep a *Sabbath*; and that *Sabbath* was *the seventh day in course from the Creation*. And is not this a goodly proof? I should think (if he would put a stress on the word *Rest*) it should rather signify, they could not *live quietly* together without their *herd-mens quarrelling* about their Pasture; for so it follows in the next words, *there was a strife* between their *herds-men*.

From thence till after their coming out of *Egypt*, he brings no other proof but that of *Ex.* 5. 4, 5. Where, when *Moses* and *Aaron* had been pressing *Pharaoh* to let *Israel* go *three days Journey into the Wilderness, to keep a Feast and Sacrifice to the Lord their God*; *Pharaoh* replies, *Wherefore do ye Lett* (or *hinder*) *the People from their Work; you make them rest from their Burdens*, or *you take them off from their Work*; that is, says he, *you make them keep a Sabbath*. For the Word or Verb there Translated *you make them Rest* is, (he tells us) a derivative from another Verb which signifies *to Rest*, from which Verb the word *Sabbath* is also derived: They did therefore *Rest* (saith he) that is *keep a Sabbath*, and that Sabbath was *every Week*, and it was on *the seventh day in course from the Creation*.

Alas! how little do either or both of these places prove, of what he would have to be granted him thence! He tells us sometimes there were other *Sabbaths*, besides that of the *seventh* day; I am sure there were other *Restings*.

If *Moſes* and *Aaron* had deſired *Pharaoh* to excuſe them from their Work *one day in ſeven*, that on ſuch day they might ſerve the Lord their God; it would have looked like an Argument. But when it is, *to go three days into the Wilderneſs to keep a Feaſt to the Lord*; what is this to a *Weekly Sabbath*?

This *Seventh-day-ſabbath*, ſo runs in the mind of this Author, that in any where he can lay hold of the word *Reſt*, he muſt preſently prove a *Seventh-day-ſabbath*. Elſe who would have thought, that becauſe *Abram* and *Lot* could not *dwell* quietly together; therefore they muſt needs keep a *Sabbath*, and that upon the *ſeventh* day, and in courſe from the *Creation*? And the like of the *Iſraelites* in *Egypt*, becauſe *Moſes* and *Aaron* are ſaid to *hinder* them from their work? Therefore they did conſtantly keep a weekly *Sabbath*, and that upon the *ſeventh* day, in courſe from the *Creation*.

He might have to better purpoſe, alleged *Pharaoh*'s *ſeven fat kine and ſeven lean ones*, and the *ſeven full Ears of Corn, and ſeven empty*; for here we have the number *ſeven* ſignalized; only theſe were Seven *Years*, not Seven *Days*, and the like of *Nebuchadnezzar*'s being *ſeven years* turned out to the *Beaſts of the field*, Dan. 4. 25, 32, 33. Or that of the *Clean Beaſts and Fowls* coming into the Ark by *ſevens*, Gen. 7. 2, 3.

But, what is more to his purpoſe (and which he ſhould not have miſſed) is that of *Gen.* 7. 4. and *Gen.* 8. 10, 12. where we have the interval of *ſeven days* particularly mentioned: *For yet ſeven days, and I will cauſe it to rain upon the Earth*, &c. (Chap. 7. 4.) where God gives to *Noah* juſt a *Weeks warning* of the time when the Floud ſhould begin, during which interval (if thoſe days were Sabbath days) he might remove himſelf and what was neceſſary into the Ark before the next Sabbath. And, toward the end of the Floud, *Noah* ſends out the *Dove*, Chap. 8. 8. *And he ſtaid ſeven days, and again ſent forth the Dove*, ver. 10. *And he ſtaid yet other ſeven days, and ſent forth the Dove*, &c. ver. 12. Where we have the Dove ſent out three times, juſt at *ſeven days* diſtance. And how do we know but that theſe *three days* were three *Sabbath days*? Which though it be not a concluſive Argument, is better than any that he brings. For here we have three *Intervals* of *ſeven days*, in theſe two Chapters.

But if a Weekly Sabbath were then kept, 'tis very ſtrange that we ſhould have no intimation of any ſuch thing in the books of *Moſes* (before *Iſrael*'s coming out of *Egypt*) And much more, that there is nothing of it in the Book of *Job*. And, that none of

of his friends (amongſt the many charges they bring againſt him) ſhould never object his *Neglect of the Sabbath*, no not of *due obſervance* thereof. Which being ſo plauſible an objection, it ſeems more likely, that a Sabbath was not then meant to be obſerved; for which he hath ſo very little to ſhew. And by what we have *Job* now in hand, it ſhould ſeem that *Job*'s *Seven* Sons kept *Feaſting* (each in his own day) for *Seven days together*, without any mention of a *Sabbath* intervening. Nor was it a *Religious Feaſt*, but a Feaſt of *mirth* and *jollity*, ſuch as made *Job* ſuſpicious leſt they might ſin and curſe God in their hearts, v. 5. And therefore he offer'd propitiatory *Sacrifices for them continually*, (or (as the Margin tells us it is in the Hebrew) *all the days*, that is every one of theſe *Seven days*.

As little a matter will ſerve his turn to prove (p. 43.) that Chriſt's *Aſcenſion* was, and his coming to *Judgment* is to be, on a *Saturday*, or *Seventh-day-Sabbath*. Becauſe (ſays he) all to that *Mount Olivet* (whence he aſcended) is, from *Jeruſalem*, a *Sabbath days journey*.

But who tells us that *by no account that he*, can make it true to aſſign the *Aſcenſion on the firſt day*. (No more can I.) But what then?

Well! But why upon a *Saturday* rather than a *Sunday*? Becauſe he obſerves, that after Chriſt's *Aſcenſion* from Mount *Olivet*, it is ſaid, *Then they returned to Jeruſalem from Mount Olivet, which is from Jeruſalem a Sabbath days journey*. Well! what of this? *He cannot ſee why it was expreſſly ſaid, that it was but a Sabbath days journey from Jeruſalem, but becauſe it was the Sabbath day.*

Perhaps I may ſhew him another reaſon as likely as his. If the word *then* do not there ſignify *the ſame day* (than only at large, *after his Aſcenſion*); this is nothing to the purpoſe. But aſſuming that by *then* be meant *the ſame day*, the connexion runs fairly thus; *after his aſcenſion they returned from thence to Jeruſalem the ſame day, for it was* (only) *but a little way off, about a Sabbath days journey*. Which, I think, is a fair account of the place. Eſpecially ſince we know otherwiſe, right reaſons why upon a Sabbath day (rather than upon any other day) they ſhould return to their habitations. But why upon a *Saturday* rather than a *Sunday*? and why *upon no account* upon the *firſt* day of the week, or their firſt day as the Sabbath (as we think it was) that of *not exceeding more than a Sabbath days journey* would as well reſpect a *Firſt-day Sabbath*, as a *Seventh-day Sabbath*. So that he is not at all concerned hereby to prove any Seventh day Sabbath.

Account (as he ſpeaks) will ſerve *as well* for the one as for the other. But, indeed, for neither.

But how doth this concern his *Coming to Judgement*? Yes, Becauſe it is there ſaid (*ver.* 11.) *He ſhall come in like manner* (ὃν τρόπον) *as ye have ſeen him go into Heaven.* And (becauſe this Author fanſies) he did *Aſcend* on a Sabbath day, therefore (he fanſies alſo) he ſhall on a Sabbath day *come again.* I ſee a *Weak Argument*, with a *ſtrong Fanſy* will go far.

But to prove his Aſcenſion to be on the Sabbath (beſides this, of a Sabbath-days Journey) he adds further, That *Chriſt and his Diſciples were then Aſſembled*, and that *Chriſt Preached.* Well! And why may we not as well conclude that the day of his *Reſurrection* was alſo a *Sabbath?* For *Chriſt and his Diſciples were then aſſembled*, (firſt at *Emmaus*, and then at *Jeruſalem*,) and *Chriſt did then alſo* (at both places) *Preach to them*, and the ſubſtance of his Preaching was much the ſame, (as will appear by comparing *Luk.* 24. with *Acts* 1.) and did then alſo Celebrate the *Lords Supper*. And *eight days after*, Chriſt was again *Aſſembled* with the *Diſciples*, and *Preached to them*, on the ſame day of the Week. If Chriſts *Preſence and Preaching* will prove the *Aſcenſion* day to be a *Sabbath*, why ſhould it not as well prove the *Reſurrection day* to be a *Sabbath?* the onely difference is, That (he thinks) ſerves his turn, But this makes againſt him.

And why ſhould it not alſo be thought a Sabbath, *Acts* 20. *For Paul and the Diſciples were then Aſſembled*; and they were aſſembled *to break Bread*; and *Paul there Preached to them.* And all theſe Aſſemblies were on the *firſt day of the Week.* And they ſeem to me a much ſtronger proof of the *Firſt* day, (the day of his *Reſurrection*) being a Sabbath, than that the *Aſcenſion* day was ſo.

And the *Preaching* which our Author here mentions as on the day of *Aſcenſion*, ſeems to me rather to have been on that of the *Reſurrection.* For St. *Luke* in the beginning of this Chapter of *Acts* 1. ſeems to give a ſhort repetition of what himſelf had delivered more at large *Luk.* 24. And gives an account not only of what happened *on the day of Aſcenſion*, (though he cloſe with it) but of what happened during the *forty days* from his Reſurrection to that time. And this *Preaching*, I take to be that mentioned *Luke* 24. on the day of his Reſurrection.

But (after all) this is but a Whimſey, (what he tells us of Chriſts Aſcenſion on a Seventh-day-Sabbath.) For 'tis very plain that his Aſcenſion was neither on a *ſeventh* day, nor on a *firſt*, but on a *fifth* day of the Week. For 'tis plainly ſaid, *Acts* 1. 3.

That

That he ſhewed himſelf alive after his Paſſion, being ſeen of them Forty days, (that is, he was ſeen of them at times, not conſtantly, for the ſpace of Fourty days) whereof that of his Reſurrection was the firſt, and that of his Aſcenſion was the laſt. And if that were *Sunday*, this muſt be *Thurſday*. He may *tell it upon his fingers* (as he ſpeaks *p.* 5.) if he pleaſe.

But though our Saviours *Aſcenſion* was not on the *ſeventh* day of the Week (in obſervance of the Seventh-day Sabbath, or in confirmation thereof.) Yet *the miſſion of the Holy Ghoſt* (according as on the Firſt day of the Week, the day of his Reſurrection, he had promiſed *Luk.* 24. 49.) was on the *firſt day of the Week* fulfilled alſo, as appears *Acts* 2. *When the day of Pentecoſt was fully come*, that is, the *Fiftieth day* (for ſo *Pentecoſt* ſignifieth in Greek) *they were all with one accord in one place* (that is, they were unanimouſly aſſembled) *and ſuddenly there came a ſound from Heaven, as of a ruſhing mighty Wind, and filled the houſe, where they were ſitting; And there appeared to them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it ſat upon each of them* (that is, at leaſt, upon each of the Apoſtles,) *and they were all filled with the Holy Ghoſt, and began to ſpeak with other Tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance.* Which I take to be a further inſtance, (if our Author will not allow it to be called a Sabbath) at leſt of a *Religious Aſſembly* for the Worſhip of God; (And if it had been on the *ſeventh* day, how great a proof would this have been with him for a *Seventh* day Sabbath.) This I take to be a *Chriſtian Sabbath*, and within the proſpect of the *Fourth Commandment*. And though it be not expreſly called a *Sabbath* (to avoid confuſion or ambiguity, becauſe the word *Sabbath* in common ſpeech was then appropriated to the Jewiſh Sabbath,) yet it is the ſame thing.

And if he doubt whether the Feaſt of *Pentecoſt* were on the Firſt day of the *Week*, as was that of the *Reſurrection*; he may be ſatisfied from *Levit.* 23. 15. where that Feaſt is appointed. After mention made of the *Paſs-over*, (*ver.* 5. &c.) *Moſes* proceeds to that of the *Wave-offering*, *v.* 10, 11. *When ye be come into the land which I give unto you, and ſhall reap the harveſt thereof; then ſhall ye bring a ſheaf of the firſt-fruits of your harveſt unto the Prieſt, and he ſhall Wave the ſheaf before the Lord to be accepted for you; on the morrow after the Sabbath the Prieſt ſhall wave it.*

Whether by the *Sabbath* here mentioned be meant the *Weekly Sabbath*, or the *firſt day of the Feaſt of Unleavened-Bread*, is not material; becauſe, in that year whereof we are ſpeaking, this *firſt day of the Feaſt* was on the *Weekly Sabbath*, (as is manifeſt from

from the story of Christ's Crucifixion, which was on the Sixth day of the Week, and the next day (being the Seventh day) was the Feast of the Pass-over; and the *morrow after this Sabbath*, was the day of Christ's Resurrection, as well as of the *Wave-offering*. And then he proceeds *verse* 16, to the Feast of *Pentecost*, or the Feast of *Weeks*. *Ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the Sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the Wave-offering; seven Sabbaths shall be complete, even unto the morrow after the seventh Sabbath, shall ye number fifty days* (inclusively taken, as the manner is in Scripture reckonings, and must needs be so here.) It was called the Feast of *Pentecost*, or the *Feast of Weeks* (as *Deut.* 16. 9, 10.) which Feast of *Pentecost* was the *morrow after the Sabbath*, on a *first day of the Week*.

And on this *first day of the Week*, (*the morrow after the seventh day Sabbath*) here was a solemn *Assembly* for *Religious Worship*, and a very large one, both of Jews and Gentiles *out of every nation under Heaven*, *Parthians*, *Medes*, *Elamites*, &c. And this solemnized by a *Miraculous Effusion of the Holy Ghost*, in the gift of Tongues. *How hear we every man in our own Tongue wherein we were born the wonderful works of God*, ver. 16, 11. With a long *Sermon* of *Peter's* on this occasion. Which I take to be another celebration of the *First-day Sabbath*, and that very eminent one.

We are to observe also, that in some of the places alleged to this purpose, though but *single instances*, there is an intimation of a *frequent usage*. As in that *Acts* 20. 7. *On the first day of the week, the disciples being assembled to break bread, Paul preached*, &c. Is a fair intimation, that on the *first day* they did use so to *assemble*.

If it were said amongst us, *About six a clock, when they were come together* (*in the College Hall*) *to supper, such a thing happened*. Any (unprejudiced) person would take it for a fair intimation, that *they used to sup about six a clock*. And if this Author could any where find, in the book of *Job*, that *On the seventh day of the week* (from the Creation) when *Job* and his friends were *assembled for the joint service of God*, *Bildad spake thus*, &c. He would take this for a *strong proof*, that the *seventh day Sabbath* was then used to be observed. Much stronger than what he alleges to that purpose, *Abram and Lot had each of them so many Cattel, that they could not dwell* (or rest) *together, without quarellings amongst their servants*. And that of what *Pharaoh* said to *Moses* and *Aaron*, *Why do you Hinder their work, you make the people Rest from their burthens*. Another place is that of 1 *Cor.* 16. 1, 2. *Now concerning the Collection*

tedious for the Saints, as I had given order to the Churches of Galatia, even so do you; and that was, what he told in those words, *Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.* It is hard to say (to use Abraham's words, Gen. xviii. 32.) *Peradventure there will lack five of the fifty righteous*; but upon the *Seventh day of the week* do things go thus? what a strong proof would this have been for the Observation of a *Seventh day* Sabbath!)

I think it is plain from hence, that the *First day of the week*, was *weekly observed*, and was *wont* to be observed, both by the *Church of Corinth*, and by the *Churches of Galatia*. For St. Paul doth not here *institute*, but *find fault*, or *inquire* for granted. What that order was to the Churches of *Galatia* our Author says *he cannot tell*. I thought it had been plain enough: he bids the *Corinthians* do, as he had bid the *Galatians*. That is, *on the First day of the Week*, &c. What *further* order he had given the *Galatians*, it is nothing to this point necessary for us to know.

But saith he, if they met on that day, *way by way*, *God hath blessed them*, *then they must on that day cast up their accounts*, *tell their money*, *reckon their flock*, *compute their Expenses*, &c. which are not Sabbath-day Works. A wise objection! as though all this could not as well be done before (so far as is necessary) and on Sunday put so much into the poor man's box (or given to the Deacons or Collectors) as (upon such account) they should have found it; like as is now done in our Churches when there is occasion for such Collections.

Why doth he not make the same exception to that of *Deut.* xvi. 9, concerning the *Feast of Pentecost*, where they are to bring a *tribute of a free-will offering*, (which says he) *thou shalt give unto the Lord thy God*, &c. *according as the Lord thy God hath blessed thee*? Doth he think that on the day of *Pentecost* (which was to be strictly observed as a Sabbath, *a holy Convocation and no servile work to be done*, Lev. xxiii. 21.) they must cast up their accounts, tell their money, &c. because they were to offer *according as the Lord hath blessed them*? I think not.

But here comes in again his former trifling objection of *one and seven*, whether it signify *the first day of the week*. Yet I am very confident, himself doth really believe it doth here so signify, and (as to his own thoughts) doubts not of it. But perhaps thinks it a piece of wit or skill in Greek, thus to object against his own judgment. Yet since he will have it so, (and we must come again to Gudio's play) I will say some what to it.

Whether

Whether μία σαββάτων be *good Greek* or no, as to the common analogy of that Tongue; or, what is the reason of that Syntax; I need not trouble my self to enquire, (because it is nothing to the purpose; for we are not inquiring whether it be *good Greek*, but what it here signifies.) There are I presume in all Languages (by negligence or corruption) some harsh expressions, as to the analogy of the Language, which yet are allowable by common usage, and well enough understood.

He would think it perhaps a little harsh to say in Greek τρισκαιδέκατος, τεσσαρεσκαιδέκατος, (that is in Latine, *tres & decimus, quatuor & decimus,*) for what we say in English *thirteenth, fourteenth*; yet so they speak. And somewhat harsh ὁ ἐχων τὸν δεκα Rev. 2. 10. Rev. 3. 11. and ἐχειν στεφανον αὐτου, Rev. 3. 11. (instead of στεφανὸν ἔλαβεν, ἐστεφανώθη) yet so it is. And ἐν ᾧ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐγένετο, yet so we find it Rev. 1. 4. And many such may be shewed.

In Latine, *idcirco, quocirca, posthac, quapropter, controversor, paterfamilias, omne genus homines, Æthiops albus dentes, pridie calendas*, and many more, are scarce to be accounted for as regular, save that they are so used; but, because they are so used, they are accounted elegant enough.

In English; *Methinks* (for *I think*,) *three pound ten shillings*, (for *three pounds*, &c.) *three foot nine inches, many a one, a few Pottage*, and the like, are scarce regular; yet are so used. When a Merchant marks his Parcels (and so calls them) *number one, number two*, &c. he means *first* and *second*. So, *in the Year of our Lord one thousand six hundred and ninety one, One thousand six hundred ninety two*, is commonly said; when yet we mean *ninety first, ninety second*; so *one a clock, two a clock*, for the *first* and *second* hour after Twelve. And other the like cases, where the *Cardinal* number is put for the *Ordinal*. As it is also in *Gen.* 1. *The evening, and morning were* (*jom echad*) *day one*; which the Septuagint renders ἡμέρα μία, and μία doth there signify πρώτη. Yet no wise man will cavil as to the sense of such expressions, (what ever they may do as to the Grammatical *construction*,) when we know what is meant by them.

So here; 'tis true μία doth properly signify *one* in common construction: but μία σαββάτων doth never signify other than *the first of the week*, (either in the New Testament or any where else,) not *any day of the week*, any more than *one a clock* doth signify any other hour than the *first* after *twelve*. When a thing is said to be done at *one a clock*; he that shall object, this may be *any hour*, for

every

every hour is *one*; would be laugh'd at. And when a Merchant bids his Prentice bring him *number one*, if he brings him what else he pleases (because every number, is *number one*, or *one number*) he deserves to be knockt.

Now when every one knows (who understands any thing of this nature,) that μία σαββάτων is the *proper name* of that day which is next after the *Jewish Sabbath*, as much as *one a clock* is the *proper name* of that hour which is next after *Twelve*: it must either be *great ignorance*, or somewhat *worse* so to object. I appeal to himself, whether ever he met with *that name* (in any Author) in any other sense.

He seems to take it very unkindly, *pag.* 66. of those who should think that, by *son of man* should be meant an ordinary Man, in *Mar.* 2. 27,28. *The Sabbath was made for Man, and not Man for the Sabbath; Therefore the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath.* Where I think it is plain, that in the former verse (*the Sabbath was made for Man*, &c.) it is manifestly spoken of *ordinary Men*. And though in the latter verse, (*the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath*,) by *Son of Man* I suppose is meant *Christ*; yet is that Title given also to ordinary Men, elsewhere, very often. As *Job*, 25. 6. *How much less Man who is a Worm, and the Son of Man which is a Worm?* And *Isai.* 51. 12. *Who art thou that shouldst be afraid of a Man that shall dy, and of the Son of Man which shall be made as Grass.* So *Ps.* 8. 4. *What is Man, that thou art mindful of him, and the Son of Man that thou visitest him?* And to the same purpose, *Ps.* 144. 3. And (to name no more) in the Book of *Ezekiel*, the Prophet *Ezekiel* is, in that one Book, called *Son of Man*, oftener than Christ is so called in the whole Bible. And if we would argue as he doth, we might plausibly object, It might be so meant here; though I think it is not. But he cannot shew that ever the *Jewish* Sabbath was called *the Lords day* (however he thinks it *might* have been;) nor (though μία be the Greek for *One*) that μία σαββάτων is ever used for other than the *first* day of the week, or the *next* after the Jewish Sabbath. Nor doth he think it. Such trifling (to give it no harder name) may do well enough in Drollery or Burlesque, but not in *a plain honest Enquiry*.

But if he would be curious as to the Phrase; 'tis plain enough that σαββάτων is not properly the Genitive case governed of μία. For then it should have been τῆ σαββάτων because σάββατον is of the Neuter Gender. (And 'tis a mistake therefore when *p.* 58. he renders it by *One of the Sabbaths*, as if it had been τῶν σαββάτων.) But 'tis governed rather of some Præposition or Particle understood, (as ἀπὸ or the like,) and then, as in Latin *pridie calendas* (that is,

pridie ante calendas) is *the next day before the Calends*: so is μία σαββάτων (or μία τῶν σαββάτων) *the next day after the Sabbath*. The full construction is μία ἡμέρα ἀπὸ σαββάτου, (the word ἡμέρα being understood in the word μία, and ἀπὸ understood in the word σαββάτων.) That is *one day after the Sabbath*; which being the *proper Name* of a day, cannot be meant of any other but *the Next day after*. 'Tis certain therefore that (μία σαββάτων) *the first day of the Week*, or the *first day after the Jewish Sabbath*, was from the Resurrection of Christ and after, eminently signalized, as a day of special *Observation*; 'Twas honoured with Christs *Resurrection* on that day; with his first *appearance* to *Mary Magdalen* and the other Women; then, to the *Two Disciples* going to *Emmaus*, and his Religious Assembling with them there; after that, to the *Disciples* at *Jerusalem* and assembling with them the same day; and the whole time of those Assemblings employed in *Religious Exercises*, (Preaching, Celebrating the Sacrament, Instructing and blessing his Disciples, and giving them Commission for Preaching the Gospel and Planting the Christian Church.) And again with the same Disciples on that day *seven night*, assembled with them, and in like manner employed. It was specially signalized also by the Miraculous Effusion of the *Holy Ghost* on that day, in a great assembly of *Jews* and *Gentiles* on the day of *Pentecost*; and the day employed in *Preaching* and other *Religious exercises*. It was observed in like manner at *Troas*, in preaching the Word, Celebrating the Sacrament, and other Religious Communion, as things there *usual* on that day. It was observed at *Corinth*, not once onely, but as a thing of *course*; and so presumed by the Apostle when he gives particular Instructions concerning a Collection for the Saints to be made weekly on that day. And in like manner in the Churches of *Galatia*, with a like direction to them. (And we have no reason to suspect but that in other Churches also, there was a like custome of observing that day.) And it is the onely day of the week (unless the Seventh-day, in order to the *Jewish* Sabbath) that is so much as Mentioned by name after the Resurrection of Christ. (At least I do not at present remember the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, or Sixth day of the week by name so mentioned.) Now what we have reason to believe was so generally observed after the Resurrection, by Christ himself (more than once,) by his Apostles, and by the Christian Churches in their days; we have reason to believe was according to Christs direction. For we know very well, that

Christ

Christ did after his resurrection *give commandments unto the Apostles, about things pertaining to the kingdome of God*; and leading the Christian Church. What those Commandments were in particular, we cannot tell; but are to presume that what they did therein, was pursuant of those commands; and this in particular about observing *the first day of the week*, which we call the *Christian Sabbath*; And which (in contradistinction to the *Jewish* Sabbath) is called *the Lords day*, Rev. 1. 10. And hath accordingly been so called, and so observed ever since. Which being so practised by the Apostles, and so continued ever since, I take to be a good warrant for us to continue it, as a thing agreeable to the Will of God.

As to what he so often objects, that there is no *express command* thereof *recorded*: that is, not such a command as our Author demands. We are not to prescribe to God in what *terms* he shall make known his Will, (any more than the Pharisees, *Mat.* 16. 4. were to prescribe to Christ what kind of *signs* he was to shew to testify his authority.) 'tis sufficient if God do in his own way intimate what is his Will, though it be it not with the formality of *Be it Enacted*. And those who are willing to be *taught of God*, will be content so to understand his meaning. An *approved Practise* in the Worship of God, frequently *Repeated*, attested by *Miracles*, encouraged by Christs own *Example*, and that of the *Apostles* and the *Christian Churches* then, and continued in the *Christian Church* ever since: Is to me great evidence of the will of God; and that there was a command for it, though it be not recorded. (Like as I believe that there was, very early, a command from God, to worship him by *Sacrifice*, though that Command be not recorded.)

But (to that of its being so observed ever since) he objects, we have nothing but *Tradition*, either that the Christian Sabbath hath been so observed, or that it is called *the Lords-day*. And *Tradition* is what he takes great pleasure to exclaim against; If that be admitted (saith he) where shall we stop?

Very well! I am not over fond of laying too great a weight upon Traditions; at least not on all things that are pretended so to be. But I pray, How can he tell, otherwise than by *Tradition*, whether our Saturday or our Sunday, be the Seventh day in course from the *Creation*? Or, (if that be too hard a question) whether of the two is the Seventh day of the *Jewish week*? I know nothing but *Tradition* for it. I cannot remember so long: Nor have I so long kept so strict account of days as to be sure of it. I trust to the common Computation of the world, that our Sab-

bath is a continuation of that Sabbath which the Apoſtles kept. And if ſo, I am ſafe. If not, I cannot help it. And becauſe I think the Apoſtles Sabbath was on the firſt day of the Jewiſh week, therefore I think ours to be ſo. But if theirs was not, neither is ours.

He would not have that of St. *John*, Revel. 1. 10. *I was in the ſpirit on the Lord's-day* to be underſtood of *our Sabbath*. And why not? He tells us, 1. Some think it to be *Chriſtmaſs-day*; 2. Some think it to be *Eaſter-day*; and 3. Some think it to be the *Day of Judgment*. And long Diſcourſes we have upon all theſe. Well! But doth he think it to be meant of any of theſe? No. Then, to what purpoſe are theſe alleged, in diſparagement of the Chriſtian Sabbath?

But he ſeems to have ſo great diſpleaſure againſt the *Chriſtian Sabbath*, that whatever he can think of to be Objected (though he do not think it to be true) he will be ſure to Object, (that he may diſparage the Day, or perplex the Argument) as if he were more concerned to beat down the *Chriſtian* Sabbath, than to ſet up the *Jewiſh*. Not conſidering, that, by all this, he is doing their Work who would have none at all. For they know well that the *Jewiſh* Sabbath hath been long ſince laid aſide (without any great fear of returning;) and if they can but throw off the *Chriſtian* Sabbath alſo, 'tis what they would have. And 'tis of a like import what he argues (*p.* 84) for coming to the publick *but once a day*, (not *twice* as our manner is;) For thoſe who care not to come at all, if he diſpenſe with them as to the One, they will diſpenſe with themſelves as to the Other meeting.

I ſhould rather think, that, the whole day being due to the Service of God (publick and private) it is to be parcelled out, as to the number and times of publick meeting; as might (according to Chriſtian Prudence) be judged moſt conducing (in this or that place) to thoſe ends, and to common Edification; and that, to make ſuch little Circumſtances (otherwiſe than as they conduce to thoſe general ends) a matter of *Religious Obſervation*, or *Divine Inſtitution*, is a like extravagance as that of the Phariſees in laying like weight on their Traditions, and that of the Papiſts on their numerous Superſtitious Ceremonies. And is as properly *ſuperſtition*, as theſe.

I do not know this Author, (who thus argues againſt obſerving the Chriſtian Sabbath, and againſt publick meeting on that day more than once;) And therefore am not willing to judge hardly. But the natural reſult of what he argues, is as I told you.

He

He doth not think that *John*, was (on the *Lords day* Rev. 1. 10.) keeping *the Anniversary of Christs Incarnation*; nor of his *Resurrection*. (No more do I.) But why not? Because (saith he) *he may say as in the case of* Moses's *dead body*, *No man knows of his Sepulchre to this day*. Now as to the *Incarnation*, I am apt to think, that no man doth *At* this day know *certainly*, either on what day of the Year, or what day of the Week Christ was born (nor is it any matter whether we do or no.) But I should rather say, no man knows *At* this day, than (as he) no man knoweth *To* this day, (as if no man hitherto had known it:) for certainly there have been those who knew it heretofore (while he was alive) though it be now forgotten, and *at this day* no man knows it. But will he say so as to the *Resurrection*? I think it is plain, that Christ was Crucified on the *fourteenth* day, lay in the Grave the *fifteenth*, and rose again the *sixteenth* day, of the *first month*. And that he rose on the *first day of the week*, no man doubts. He should rather have put it thus, *As no man knows* To *this day*, *where is the Body of* Moses, (that it might not be worshiped,) So *no man knows* At *this day*, *which is the Seventh in ocurse from the Creation*; that we might not contend about it.

However, I am contented to admit, (if that will please him) that *the Lords day* there mentioned was neither meant of *Christmass day*, nor *Easter day*, nor *Whit-sunday*, nor the *day of Judgment*; but think it to be meant of *the first day of the week*, which is the *Christian Sabbath*. Not, of any of those other days mentioned; nor of the *Jewish Sabbath*, as he would have it.

'Tis, I think, a new notion of his own (at least I know none other of his mind) that it should be meant of the *Jewish Sabbath*. He grants there is *nothing from the Circumstances of the place to determine it to this day*. Nor doth he pretend to shew that the Jewish Sabbath *was* ever so called. But he thinks it *might have been* so called. For he says *God blessed and sanctified the seventh day* (that is, the Seventh day after Six days of Labour) therefore it *might have been* called the *Lords* day: and so may as well the *Christian Sabbath* as the *Jews Sabbath*. That *the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath day*; And so he is of every day in the Week; and of the *Christian Sabbath* (when that is the Sabbath) as well as of the *Jewish*. That the *seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord our God*; that is, the Seventh day after Six days of Labour, but whether the Seventh day in course from the Creation, is no where said. That *Isai.* 58. 13. *The Sabbath* is called *my*

holy,

holy day: True, on what ever day the Sabbath be; First or Seventh of the Week; or whatever day God appoints to be kept *Holy*. As for instance, *the first and seventh day of the Feast of Unleavened bread*, Ex. 12. 16. The *first* day shall be a *Holy* Convocation; and the *Seventh* day shall be a *Holy* Convocation; and each of them was *the Lords Holy day*, on what ever day of the week they happened. And the like for other days. So *Levit.* 23. 2, 4, 7, 8, 21, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 32, 35, 36, 39. and *Num.* 28. 18, 25, 26. *Num.* 29. 1, 7, 12, 35. All the days here mentioned are *the Lords Holy days*, yet I do not take any of them to be κυριακὴ ἡμέρα. And all he can pretend to from these or whatever he produceth, is no more but that the *Jewish* Sabbath (while it was the Sabbath) *might have* been so called, κυριακὴ ἡμέρα *the Lords day*; he doth not pretend to shew that ever *it was* so called.

Now I would desire this Gentleman (if he can but a little while lay aside his prejudice) to consider, first that *the Lords day* was the *proper name* of a day; whereby it might be known as distinguished from other days; (else to what purpose is it said *I was in the spirit on the Lords day*;) whereas the *proper name* of the *Jewish Sabbath* (and of that onely as he would have us think *p.* 64.) was the *Sabbath day*; and there is no appearance of reason, why, if he meant that day, he should not rather have said *I was in the spirit on the Sabbath day*, or *the seventh day*. This therefore must needs be meant of some other day, known by another name.

2. I would have him next consider, that *the Lord* in the Old Testament is the usual name of *God* indefinitely; without particularizing this or that of the Three persons; and *the Sabbath of the Lord thy God*, doth not appropriate it to the *second* Person more than to the *first* and *third*. And though I do not deny, that our *Christ* was the *God* who gave the Ten Commandments (for all the three Persons are the same God,) yet I do not think it to be Christ onely, as contradistinguished to the other two. And when it is said, *I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt have no other God but me*; the meaning is not, I the *second Person*, am so the Lord thy God, that thou shalt own no *other Person* for thy *God* beside *me the second Person*. But ὁ κύριος *the Lord*, in the *New Testament*, is for the most part applied peculiarly to *our Lord Christ* (God and Man.) and is understood κατ' ἐξοχὴν of him. (As he is called elsewhere κατ' ἐξοχὴν *the Son of Man*.) And accordingly ἡμέρα κυριακὴ must be a day peculiarly appropriate (τῷ κυρίῳ) to *our Lord Christ*; which the Jewish Sabbath was not, nor that of the Fourth Commandment;

which

which is the Sabbath of the *Lord* [illegible], that is *of God indefinitely*; for 'tis in that notion that God speaks in the Ten Commandments, not as *one person* contradistinct to the other two.

It is ἡμέρα κυριακὴ *the Lords day* in a like sense as δεῖπνον κυριακὸν, the *Lords Supper*, 1 Cor. 11. 20. and ποτήριον κυρίου, τράπεζα κυρίου, *the Cup of the Lord*, *the Table of the Lord*, 1 Cor. 10. 21, 22. 1 Cor. 11. 27. In all which, by *the Lord* is meant the *Lord Christ*, God and Man. And because, there being a double *Sabbath* then in use, (the *Jewish* Sabbath, and the *Christian* Sabbath,) and the word *Sabbath* indefinitely having been a long time applied to the *Jewish* Sabbath, and would be apt to be understood of it; therefore (by way of distinction) that of the Christians (though a *Sabbath* also, within the sense of the Fourth Commandment) was called *the Lords day*, as being the Day or Sabbath appropriate to *our Lord Jesus Christ*. And therefore when he tells us, so often, the World was made by *our Lord Jesus Christ*, and the Law given on Mount *Sinai* by *our Lord Jesus Christ*, (upon which Notions he seems to lay great stress, though it be nothing to the purpose,) I think it is a mistake. For *our Lord Jesus Christ* is *God and Man*, but he was not *God and Man* when the World was made, or the Law given, but onely *God*. 'Tis true *Christ as God*, (according to his Divine Nature) is the same *God* who made the World, and gave the Law, (for we have no other *God* but one) but not as *God and Man*. For Man he was not at that time, but in the fulness of time *became* Man. The Sabbath *of the Lord our God* (in the fourth Commandment, with equal respect to all the Three Persons) doth not signify the same as, The Sabbath of *our Lord Jesus Christ* (God and Man.) *The Lord our God* there, not the same with *our Lord Jesus Christ*, in the New Testament. But δεῖπνον κυριακὸν (*the Lords Supper*) is the *Supper of our Lord Jesus Christ* (God and Man) the Founder of our Christian Religion: And accordingly ἡμέρα κυριακὴ (*the Lords day*) is the *day of our Lord Jesus Christ*, a day appointed by him.

3. I would have him consider further, that *the Lords day*, (*dominica*, or *dies dominicus*,) hath been all along, in all ages of the Christian Church, used as *the proper name* of what we otherwise call the *Christian Sabbath*; and not for the *proper name* of any other day; and therefore, till somewhat do appear to the contrary, I shall take it to be the same with what is called *the Lords day* in Scripture.

There is, in the New Testament, a place called *Rome*; and there is at this day a place in *Italy* called *Rome*, and which hath been so called all along ever since; neither do I know of any other eminent

nent place of called. Therefore (till somewhat do appear to the contrary) I shall presume our *Rome* to be the same place with that which in the New Testament is called *Rome*.

We find in Scripture there is an Island of the Mediterranean Sea called *Melita* or *Malta* (where St. *Paul* suffered Ship-wrack) not far from another Island called *Crete*. Now we know also there is in the Mediterranean Sea an Island called *Malta* at this day, and another not far from thence called *Crete* or *Candy*, and we do not know of any other Islands so called, then, or at any time since; and therefore we may safely presume (till somewhat do appear to the contrary) that those Islands now so called, are the same Islands with those which were then so called.

And in like manner, that Day which hath been ever since called *the Lords-day* as by its *proper name*, we may and ought to presume to be the same day which was by St. *John* so called (as by its proper name) in *Rev.* 1. 10. when he wrote the Book of the Revelation; till it can be shewed that he did by that name mean some other day.

And we have the more reason so to presume, because we find it so called by others, very soon after St. *John*'s time; and by those whom we have great reason to believe to have been well acquainted with St. *John*'s meaning and his manner of speech.

The first I shall name is St. *Ignatius*, who was not onely Contemporary with St. *John*, but was a Disciple or Scholar of St. *John*. Now St. *John* (according to the best account we can have from Chronology) wrote his Revelation in *Patmos* (whither he was banished by *Domitian*,) in or about the year of our Lord 96; (after which he wrote his Gospel, upon his return from *Patmos* to *Ephesus*:) And Died in the Year 98 or 99 under *Trajanus*. And *Ignatius* died a Martyr under the same Emperour *Trajan*, in the Year of our Lord 107. So that there is no great distance in time. (And if we should miss a year or two it is not material.) How long before his death *Ignatius* wrote his Epistle to the *Magnesians*, we are not sure (nor is it material;) Now in that his Epistle to the *Magnesians*, even according to the genuine Edition published by Bishop *Usher* out of an ancient Manuscript (not that which is justly suspected to be interpolated,) he doth earnestly exhort them not to *Judaize*, but to live as *Christians*; (*Si enim usque nunc secundum Judaismum vivimus; confitemur gratiam non recepisse.*) And as to the Sabbath in particular, *Non amplius Sabbatizantes, sed secundum Dominicam viventes, in qua & vita nostra orta est:*) *Not any longer observing the Jewish Sabbath, but the Lords Day*

Day on which Christ our L[illegible] manifest therefore, that within 8 or 10 years [illegible] *the Lords day* did not signify the Jewish Sabbath, but the *first day of the week, on which our Saviour Rose again*; and that it was then observed in contradistinction to the Jewish Sabbath. I forbear to mention his Epistle *ad Trallianos* (where again we have usually applied to the first day of the week on which Christ rose again) because it is in that Edition which is suspected to be Interpolated.

I might to this add the Testimony of *Polycarp*, who was also a Disciple of St. *John*, and collected and published those Epistles of *Ignatius*; and may be presumed to understand what St. *John* meant by *the Lords day*.

But I shall add in the next place that of *Justin Martyr*; whom though I cannot call a *Disciple* of St. *John* (because he was not *converted* to the Christian Religion till about the Year of our Lord 120, about Thirty years after St. *John's* Death,) yet he *lived* so soon after, that he could not be ignorant of the Christians Practice, and what they understood St. *John* to mean by *the Lords Day*. And how that day was observed in *Justin's* time, he tells us in (what is called) his *Second Apology*, [illegible] and a little after [illegible] *On that day commonly called Sunday, there is held a Congregation or a general Meeting together, of all Inhabitants whether of City or Country, and there are publickly read the Memorials in Monuments of the Apostles, or the Writings of the Prophets, &c.* And again, *The day called Sunday we do all in common make our common Meeting day; for that the First-day is it on which God, from Darkness and Matter made the World, and our Saviour Jesus Christ did on the same day rise from the dead.* In which places, though it be not called *dominica*, but *dies solis*, yet how it was then *solemnly observed*, in memory of our *Lord Christ's Resurrection*, is evident.

'Tis manifest therefore that *the Lords day* (κυριακὴ ἡμέρα, *Dominica*, or *Dies Dominicus*,) was the *known name* of a day so called when St. *John* wrote his *Revelation*. That it was a day of Religious Worship contradistinguished to that of the *Jewish Sabbath*, so observed and so *called* by (St. *John's* Disciple) *Ignatius* within 8 or 10 years at most after St. *John's* writing that Book; (Which he would not have done, if he had not thought it to be so meant by

his Master St. *John*. [illegible] manner it was observed (in their solemn religious [illegible] *Justin Martyr* tells us within no years after that; and that it was otherwise called (ἐν ἡλίου ἡμέρᾳ) *Sunday*. And that *Dominica* or *Dies Dominicus*, hath been so used not onely by the Ancient Christian Writers, *Ignatius*, *Clemens*, *Irenæus*, *Origen*, *Tertullian*, &c. but by the *Councils* and *Church History* all along; hath been so often shewed by divers, and is to be seen by any who please to consult them, as is not to be doubted by any; unless we would (under the notion of *Tradition*) deny all History; which in a plain matter of Fact were very unreasonable. Nor can he shew that the name of *the Lords day* ever was (however it might have been as he thinks) attributed to the *Jewish* Sabbath. And therefore to tell us that this name is *stolen* from the *Jewish* Sabbath to be applied to *ours*, is such a Fancy as may be *laughed at*, but doth not deserve a serious Answer. Sure we are that the *Christian* Sabbath hath been long in possession of that Name; but, that ever the *Jewish* Sabbath was so, there is no evidence. Therefore the *Theft* must be on his side, who *steals* it from us to give it to the Jewish Sabbath.

But he tells us, that our Saviour himself observed the Jewish Sabbath. (And I suppose he did so. And, that he was Circumcised also, and did observe the Ceremonial Law.) But it was before his Death and Resurrection. I do not find that he observed it afterward.

But he says, after Christs Death when he had said *It is finished, he kept the Sabbath in the Grave*. Be it so (if that were *keeping a Sabbath*.) And the good Women *rested* on that day *according to the Commandment*. And why not? Since Christ was not yet risen; nor was the day yet changed, or pretended so to be. This therefore is but Whimsey and nothing to the purpose. We all agree; that, till the Resurrection of Christ, the Jews observed the Jewish Sabbath, on what they called the Seventh-day of their Week. But whether or no it were a Seventh from the Creation, we cannot tell.

'Tis more to the purpose what he tells us, that *Paul* and other Christians did after Christs Resurrection seem to observe the Jewish Sabbath; Going to the *Temple* and to the *Synagogues on the Sabbath-day*; meaning thereby the *Jewish* Sabbath. And it is true; They did so go. But I answer;

1. So they did on other days as well as on the Sabbath, and in other places, as well as in the Synagogue and the Temple, *Act* 5. 42. *Dayly in the Temple, and in every house*, or *from house to house*

(πᾶσάν

(wards Nations, &c.) [illegible] ceased not to preach *Jesus Christ*. And Act. 2. 46. *they continued daily with one accord in the Temple, and breaking bread at home*, or *from house to house*. As to such duties of Worship as were common to them with the Jews, they took the opportunity of joining therein with them; whether on their Sabbath, or on any other day; but as to what was peculiarly *Christian*, that they performed in separate meetings from them; *breaking their Bread at home*, (*κατ' οἶκον*), or *from house to house*. The Sacrament of the Lords Supper (being peculiarly a *Christian* service) they did celebrate in their houses, or separate places of meeting. And so we find it at *Troas*, and, *on the first day of the week*; Act. 20. 7. *on the first day of the week, when the Disciples were met to break bread*, Paul *preached*, &c. Their meeting for this *Christian* service, was in a separate *place*, and on another *day*, from that of the *Jewish* service. And *Paul* at *Athens*. Act. 17. 17. *he disputed in the Synagogue with the* Jews, *and with the devout persons, and in the Market, Daily*, (*καθ' ἡμέραν τοῖς*,) He took the opportunity of publick meetings, whether in the Synagogues or elsewhere, whether on the Sabbath or any other day, to preach Christ to them, whether Jews or Greeks. Which doth not prove that they did then take the *seventh* day to be the *Christian Sabbath*; any more than our going to Hear or Preach a Week-day Lecture, suppose on *Thursday*, would prove, that we take *Thursday* to be our Sabbath; or *Paul's* Preaching on *Mars-hill*, or in the *Market-place*, would prove that he took these places to be the Temple or Synagogue. He knew these to be Times and Places of concourse, and therefore took the opportunity of Preaching Then and There; and would so have done at any other time and place as there was occasion. *In season or out of season*, as he adviseth *Timothy*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 2.

He doth not deny, p. 122. but that *Paul* did *keep the Feast* (of the *Pass-over*) *after the Resurrection of Christ*; Because of what we have Act. 18. 21. *He bids them farewel* (at *Ephesus*) saying, *I must by all means keep this Feast that cometh*, at Jerusalem; *but I will return again unto you, if God will.* Which Feast he thinks to be that of the *Pass-over*, *though it be not named.* But whether that or whatever Feast of the Jews it be, it is all one as to our business. How great a proof would this have been for the *Seventh-day-Sabbath*, if it had been said *I must by all means keep the Sabbath!* 'Tis said indeed, he did *on the Sabbath-day go into the Synagogue* (but so he did on other days,) but not that he *kept* the Sabbath-day; much less that *he must by all means Keep it.* Or that

he must *by all means* [illegible] *from Ephesus to Jerusalem* rather than *not keep* it, though he were *to return thither again*. Yet this Author doth not, for all this think, the Law for the *Jewish Pass-over* to be then in force. But onely that *Paul took occasion to be there at that publick great concourse of People, to preach Christ to the multitude*. For, *that the Apostles were under no obligation to keep that feast of the Pass-over, after the death of Christ, is to him* (he says) *past doubt*. And why may not we say the same of his *going into the Synagogue on the Sabbath day* (rather than miss such an opportunity of a *publick concourse*) which was a less journey than *from Ephesus to Jerusalem*? though *under no obligation to keep the Jewish Sabbath*, more than *to keep the Jews Pass-over*.

2. But I answer further. The Jews who were not Christians, did yet continue to observe the Jewish Sabbath as a matter of duty. And there was no reason why they should not. For, while they did not acknowledge our *Christ* to be the *Messiah*, nor the *Mosaick* Law to be at an end, but Circumcision and the Jewish Oeconomy yet in force, there was no reason why they should not think themselves obliged to the Jewish Sabbath. And many of the *Christian* Jews, who were not yet satisfied of the Abolition of the Mosaick Law, did comply with them therein. For knowing this to have been a law once, and not yet being fully satisfied that it was expired, they were content still to observe it. (And if our Gentleman be of that mind, I would not hinder him, if a Jew, from so doing; but neither would I incourage him.) And I find the Apostles willing to connive at it, and even to countenance it. Not as a thing *necessary*, but at least allowable.

And though they did not think fit to bring a *new Yoke* upon the *Gentiles*, who had not before been obliged to the Jewish Law, (and therefore would not allow the *Gentiles* to be *Circumcised*; as appears by S. *Paul*'s Epistle to the *Galatians*, and the Decrees of the Synod at *Jerusalem*, Act. 15.) yet he allowed the *Jews* to practise it (to whom it had once been a Law) and accordingly *Circumcised Timothy* Act. 16. because, though his Father were a Greek, yet his Mother was a Jew: (but he did not Circumcise *Titus*, *Gal.* 2. 3. for whom there was not the same reason.)

And he did himself comply with the *Jewish* ceremonies; As *Act.* 18. 18. *Having shorn his head in Canchrea; For he had a vow.* And those of *Purification* Act. 21. Not that he thought those Laws now obliging; but, because many of the *believing Jews* were yet *zealous of the Law*, and thought themselves obliged by it, he would not *give offense to them*. For he was satisfied as to himself,

that

that *Circumcision availeth nothing*, nor *Uncircumcision*, 1 Cor. 7. 19. Gal. 6. 15. But was content (till by time and further instruction they should be better satisfied) that each one should be resolved as to their own practise, according to their own sentiments as to things yet disputable.

And accordingly, as to *eating* or *not eating* things forbidden by *Moses*'s Law, his advise was, to the *Romans*, (many of whom were Jews) *Rom.* 14. 27. *Let not him that eateth not, judge him that eateth*, (as breaking a Law which he thinks to be yet in force,) *nor let him that eateth, despise him that eateth not*, (as a fool, that doth not understand his own liberty) *for the kingdom of God is not meat and drink*, &c.

And in like manner those at *Jerusalem* Act. 15. though they did not think fit to bring a *new Yoke* of *Circumcision* upon the *Gentiles* (to whom before it had not been a Law) yet do advise them to forbear *things strangled and blood*, because this had once been a Law to all the Sons of *Noah*, Gen. 9. 4.

Not but that this was even now antiquated, but (to avoid offense) because it had once been a Law. For I take even those things to fall under these Generals, *The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost*, Rom. 14. 17. and *every creature of God is good*, 1 Tim. 4. 4. *I know, and am perswaded that there is nothing unclean of it self*: But *all things indeed are pure*, Rom. 14. 14, 20. Tit. 1. 15. *Meat commendeth us not to God; for neither if we eat, are we the better*, (as making use of our lawful liberty) *neither if we eat not* (in compliance with those who be unsatisfied) *are we the worse*, 2 Cor. 8. 8.

So that the Practise of the Apostles or of the Church at that time, in compliance with the Jews, as to what had before been a Law, but now was not; is no argument that the thing was then obligatory, as before it had been, but onely an argument of their condescension in things of a middle nature, rather than to give offense to those who were therein unsatisfied; according to that principle of his *All things are lawful for me but all things are not expedient*, 1 Cor. 10. 23. *To give no offense either to Jew or Gentile, or to the Church of God*, ver. 32, 33. *To the Jews I became as a Jew; To the weak I became as weak; I am made all things to all men*, 1 Cor. 9. 19. In so much that even in those things which he knew to be lawful, yet, rather than give offense to a weak brother, he would forbear, *If meat make my brother to offend*, (or, be an offense to a brother) *I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my Brother to offend*.

And

And the like I suppose is to the *Jewish Sabbaths*: *He that regardeth a day, regardeth it to the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks*, Rom. 14. 6. Where 'tis manifest that he doth parallel the observing or not observing a day (then questionable) with the abstaining from meats disputable; that is, from such as before were unlawful, but now ceased so to be, though all were not yet therein satisfied.

And though it be not expressly said, what was the *Day* thus in question; yet it is most likely to be that of the *Jewish Sabbath*; For, that the *first day of the Week* or *Christian Sabbath* was now observed, seems very plain: and whether the *Jewish Sabbath* should be observed also, was the question. And those who were for continuing *Circumcision* and the *Mosaick* Ceremonies, were doubtless for that also. And the Apostles Rule was for a mutual condescension (as to the Jews) for each to follow their own sentiments therein, without censuring one another.

But as to the Gentiles, he seems to be of another mind; And therefore to the *Galatians*, who were most of them *Gentile-Christians*, he would not so much as *allow* the practise of *Circumcision* (which to the Jews he did;) and tells them that *if they be Circumcised Christ profiteth them nothing*; and *he that is Circumcised is debtor to the whole Law*, Gal. 5. 2, 3. For it was a renouncing Christ who had made them Free; putting themselves under the Jewish Yoke, to which (even before) they were not subject.

And therefore to these he speaks more warmly, *Gal.* 1. 6, 7. *I marvel that you are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ, unto another Gospel: Which is not another*, (or, *there being no other Gospel* ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο, where as there is not any other Gospel;) *onely there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the Gospel of Christ.* And such are those who would bring on them a *new Yoke*, (by making that a *Duty* which God had not made so.) Where he presseth them to keep close to the Gospel of Christ, as by him delivered (without any connexion of *Moses*'s Law,) there being indeed *no other Gospel* but that; and they who teach them otherwise, *do pervert the Gospel*; the true Gospel of Christ, including no obligation to the Jewish Law; either as to *Circumcision* or the *difference of meats*, or other particulars of that Law; as he argues, in the second, third and fourth Chapters; shewing that even those who were before under it, are now freed

from

from it, and they much more who were never under it. And thereupon *Chap.* 4. 9, 10, 11. he rebukes them severely, that *after they had known God (or rather were known of God) they should turn again to the weak, and beggarly rudiments or elements. Ye observe* (saith he) *days and months and times and years. I am afraid of you lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain.*

'Tis not indeed here said in particular, what those *days* were, that are here meant; yet it is most likely (and scarce to be doubted) to be meant of the *Jewish Sabbath*. For though other Observation of Times be here reckoned up (there being the same reason of all) yet there was no occasion for the *others*, in *Galatia*. For the Jews themselves did not think themselves obliged (nor do the Jews at this day) to the observation of their *other* Feasts or Fasts out of their own land. But to that of *Circumcision*, and of the *Jewish Sabbath*, and the distinction of *Meats*, they thought themselves obliged even out of their own land. And of such we must understand this to the *Galatians*. These being the things there in question; not those other, which were confined to the land of *Canaan*.

But he objects here, that though *Days* be mentioned, yet not *Sabbath-days*; and fancies it might be meant of some *other* days; not of *Sabbaths*. To gratify him therefore in this also, I will proceed to that of *Colos.* 2. 16. Where *Sabbaths* are *expressly named*. To the *Colossians*, who were also Christian *Gentiles*, he pursues the same notions; *Least any one should beguile them with inticing words*, Col. 2. 4. (thereby to bring them under the *Mosaick* Law:) He bids them *Beware lest any spoil them through Philosophy and vain deceit*. Whereby, I suppose, he means the Mosaick doctrines or Philosophy of the Jews, (which *Clemens Alexandrinus* doth all along call φιλοσοφιαν βαρβαρον in contradistinction to that of the Greeks,) *after the traditions of men, after the rudiments* (or *elements*) *of the world, and not after Christ*, ver. 8. and that particularly of *Circumcision* ver. 11. (in the room of which, *Baptism* is come; *ver.* 12.) Christ, by his Death *having blotted out the hand-writing of ordinances* (meaning the Jewish Law) *and took it out of the way, nailing it to his Cross*, ver. 14. and (amongst other things) *Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink* (as if some were now *clean* others *unclean*, as under the Mosaick Law,) *or in respect of an holy day*, (ἑορτῆς a *Festival*) *or of the new Moon, or of the Sabbath days*; ἢ νεομηνίας ἢ σαββάτων, ver. 16. Where by *Sabbath* must be meant the *Jewish Sabbath*; the day which in common speech was understood by the word *Sabbath*.

For

For this, he hath two or three evasions. He doth commonly press hard in other places, that by *Sabbath* is to be understood the Jews *Seventh-day-Sabbath*, and *no other day*. (*The holy Spirit doth call the Seventh-day, the Sabbath, (and no other day of the week) both in the Old and in the New Testament throughout*, p. 46. And, I think, he is not much out therein; that it doth, usually, so signify where it doth not come with some intimation to direct us to some other sense. And why it should not be thought so to signify here, I see no reason. For though I take our *Christian Sabbath* to fall as properly under the word *Sabbath* in the Fourth Commandment, as that of the *Jews*; yet the word, in common use, having by this time become the *proper name* of that Day which the Jews so called, it was necessary (to avoid confusion) to give the Christian Sabbath another name; as that of *the Lords-Day*, or the *first day of the week*. And consequently that the *Sabbaths* here mentioned, are to be understood (according to the then use of the word) of *those* Sabbaths. Not as if all days of *Holy Rest* where hereby forbidden; but onely the nicety of *confining* it particularly to that day which was then (in common speech) so called.

But he would not have it *here* understood of the *Seventh-day* Sabbath (as every where else) but some other *Ceremonial Sabbaths*; but what those are, he doth not tell us.

That there were some other *Feasts* observed by the Jews, which, in the Old Testament, are sometimes called *Sabbaths* (but very seldome,) I do not deny: nor that those come under the general Words in this place. But those do not seem to be here principally intended, because it is manifest to be understood of the Sabbath *there* in dispute. Now there was no occasion of a dispute concerning the observance of those *other Sabbaths*, amongst the Gentiles, out of the *Holy-land*. These observations being not thought obligatory, even to the Jews, but in their own Land onely. And it is expressly provided, *Deut.* 16. that these were not to be kept in any place promiscuously; *not within any of the Gates which the Lord thy God giveth thee; But in the place which the Lord thy God shall chuse to place his name there*. So of the *Pass-over*, ver. 5, 6. So of the Feast of *Pentecost*, ver. 11. So of the Feast of *Tabernacles*, ver. 15. And of altogether, *ver.* 16. And therefore, not out of their own Land. I do not deny but that they might, in private houses, *eat the Paschal Lamb*, (as Christ did, with his Disciples,) but not *Sacrifice* the Pass-over. For it was to be *sacrificed* in the *Temple* onely; and the *Feast of the Pass-*

Pass-over to be *there* solemnly kept. Not in private houses; and much less *out of their own Land*.

Nor do I remember, that any where in all the New Testament, the word *Sabbath* is used for any *such* Sabbaths: Nor can reasonably be supposed to be here meant of those *Feasts*, because it is put in contradistinction to them. *Let no man judge you in respect of a Feast, of the New-moon, or of the Sabbaths.* Which yet I do not understand as if *no* Sabbath might now be kept, but that the Obligation to *that* Sabbath was now at an end.

Another evasion is this; He would have σάββατων (*Sabbata*) in the plural number, to signify *Weeks*, not *Sabbath-days*. The *Sabbath-day* being called, in the singular number, σάββατον (*Sabbatum*). For he will rather play at small game than stand out. If we should allow him this, it would not advance his purpose at all. For if the business of *Weeks* be at an end, (that we are no longer to distribute our time into *Weeks*,) than that of the *Sabbath* much more, which he would have to be the seventh day of the *Week*.

But suppose we do allow that *one* Sabbath is to be called *Sabbatum*, what are we to call *two* or *more* Sabbaths? Must not they be *Sabbata*? And if this be his meaning, then are we not to observe such *Sabbaths* any longer.

But what must we then say to *Mat.* 28. 1. ὀψὲ σαββάτων, which we render *In the end of the Sabbath*, meaning thereby the *Seventh-day Sabbath* then past, τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων, *as it began to draw towards the first day of the Week*: must we read it, *at the end the Sabbaths* (because σαββάτων is in the plural number,) *when the Sabbaths* (meaning the *Seventh-day* Sabbaths) *were now at an end, and the First-day Sabbath coming on in their place?* If that reading please him; it will serve us as well.

But he is mistaken in his criticism. 'Tis true that σάββατων in the plural number seems to be sometime put for *a Week* (but not *Weeks*, that I know of, as he would have it.) And so it is commonly taken to be where we find μιᾶ σαββάτων, for *the first day of the Week* (but may as well be rendered, *the first day after the Sabbath.*) And so is σάββατα in the singular, as *Luke* 18. 12. νηστεύω δὶς τοῦ σαββάτου, *I fast twice in the week*. I suppose he would not have us render it *I fast twice on the Sabbath day* (though it be in the singular number,) as if he did *fast twice* upon *one day*. But thus rather, *I keep two Fasts to one Sabbath*; which is the same in sense with, *I fast twice in the Week*. In like manner as the *Olympiad*, may be taken sometime for that particular year on which were the *Olympick Games* (which were wont to return

every *fifth year* inclusively, that is, as we use to speak the *fourth year after* the last *Olympick*; sometime for the *interval of four years* from the end of one Olympick to the end of the next following. So here, *Sabbatum* may be sometime taken strictly for the *Sabbath-day*, and sometime for the whole *septiduum* or *week* from Sabbath to Sabbath.

And so is *Sabbata* (in the plural number) taken also for a *Sabbath-day*; Thus I take it to be here, (*Mat.* 28. 1.) ὀψὲ δὲ σαββάτων when the *Sabbath-day* was ended; in the same sense with that of *Mark* 16. 1. διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου (speaking of the very same time) *when the Sabbath was past*. And in like manner, *Matth.* 12. 1. *At that time Jesus went on the Sabbath day through the Corn*; τοῖς σάββασιν (*Sabbatis*) in the plural number. And so it is in *Mark* 2. 23. ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν. Yet it is meant but of *one* day, as appears by the parallel place (where the same is again related) *Luk.* 6. 1. ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ. And so *Mat.* 12. 5, 10, 12. *Mar.* 3. 4. *Luk.* 4. 31. *Luk.* 6. 2, 9. And σάββατα in the Septuagint is commonly put for the *Sabbath-day*. I will not say *Allways* (because I have not examined it) but in all the places which I consulted. And even in the body of the Ten Commandments *Exod* 20. 8. μνήσθητι τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν σαββάτων. (*Remember the day of the Sabbaths*; in the plural number.) And again ver. 10. τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ σάββατα τῷ θεῷ σου (*but the seventh day Sabbaths to the Lord thy God*;) So *Ex.* 16. 23. σάββατα ἀνάπαυσις ἁγία τῷ κυρίῳ αὔριον. (*the Sabbaths a holy Rest unto the Lord, to morrow.*) And *Levit.* 23. 3. *six days shall work be done, but the seventh is* σάββατα *the Sabbaths of Rest; ye shall do no work therein,* σάββατά ἐστι τῷ κυρίῳ *it is the Sabbaths of the Lord.* Which are the signal places wherein the Sabbath is commanded. And the like very often (if not always) in the Septuagint, whose language the New Testament doth usually follow. So that his criticism comes to nothing, but only to shew how *careless* he is of *what* he says if at least he may seem to say *somewhat*. (Such is that when he tells us *p.* 136. that *God who hath reserved a Tenth of our Substance, hath reserved But a Seventh of Time.* As though he thought a *tenth part* to be more than a *seventh part*. And many such negligences, which I spare to mention.)

But whether we render it *Sabbath-day* or *Sabbath-days* the sense is still the same. And the Apostles design in all these places seems to be this, that though to the *Jews*, to whom it had once been a Law, he doth allow a liberty (till they should be better satisfied) for each to follow his own judgment (without censuring others) as well in this of the *Jewish Sabbath*, as in the business of *Circumcision*, and the abstinence from *Meats*, and their other *Rites*;

yet he would by no means ſuffer theſe to be brought upon the *Gentiles* as a *new Yoke* to which before they had not been ſubject.

I ſay as a *new Yoke* to which they had not been ſubject. For though I do admit that by natural light, or the Law of *Nature*, man ought to allow a *competent time* for the ſolemn ſervice of God; and, by a *poſitive* Law, that it ſhould be at leaſt *one day in ſeven*, that is, *after ſix days of Labour*, the *ſeventh* to be a day of *Reſt*; and ſo much to be intended in the *Fourth Commandment*. Yet, I do not think it to be ſo determined to *this* day in order, as to be unchangable to after Ages.

We can be no ways ſure, that the *ſeventh* day in order from the firſt raining of *Manna*, Ex. 16. was the *ſeventh* in order from the *Creation*. And as they did obſerve it then in order from thence; ſo when *Chriſt*, or his Apoſtles by direction from him, did put it into a new order, this new order doth as well ſute the words of the Fourth Commandment as that former.

I do the rather ſay that this to the Gentiles is a *new Yoke*, becauſe I find this to be given as a *ſign*, a *covenant*, or diſtinctive *mark* given to the Jews, as Gods *peculiar People*, in contradiſtinction to other Nations; juſt as *Circumciſion* was. So *Exod.* 31. 13. *My Sabbaths ye ſhall keep, for it is a Sign between me and you throughout your generations*, and ver. 16. *The Children of Iſrael ſhall keep the Sabbath, to obſerve the Sabbath throughout their generations for a perpetual Covenant*, and ver. 17. *It is a Sign between me and the Children of Iſrael for ever*. So Ezek. 20. 12. *I gave them my Sabbaths to be a Sign between me and them*; and *ver.* 20. *They ſhall be a Sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God*. Juſt as it is ſaid of *Circumciſion*, Gen. 17. 7. *I will eſtabliſh my Covenant between me and thee* (ſaith God to *Abraham*) *and thy ſeed after thee, for an Everlaſting Covenant, to be a God unto thee and thy ſeed after thee*: and *ver.* 10, 11. *This is my Covenant which ye ſhall keep between me and you, and thy ſeed after thee, every male-child among you ſhall be Circumciſed, and it ſhall be a Token of the Covenant between me and you*: and *ver.* 13. *My Covenant ſhall be in your fleſh an everlaſting Covenant*, (not as if *Circumciſion* were to be *for ever* obligatory; but *rebus ſic ſtantibus*, ſo long as things continued in that eſtate.) And ſo it is called *Rom.* 4. 11. *He received the Sign of Circumciſion, a Seal of the Righteouſneſs of Faith*. And ſuch was the *Bloud of the Paſchal Lamb on the Door-poſts of the houſe*, Ex. 12. 7. to be a *diſtinctive mark* between the *Iſraelites* and the *Egyptians*; as *ver.* 13. *The bloud ſhall be to you for a Token upon the houſes where you are, and when I ſee the bloud*

I will pass over you. And so *Exod.* 11, 5, 6, 7. *That ye may know how that the Lord doth put a Distinction between the Egyptians and Israel.*

And our Author himself, *pag.* 26. doth press the same, and puts great weight upon it, that *this Seventh-day-sabbath is often called a Sign for ever between him and them, and a perpetual Covenant, to Distinguish his people from others*; that is, the people of the Jews from other Nations. And so to be *a Sign for Ever*, as Circumcision is an *Everlasting Covenant*.

Now whatsoever was a *Distinctive Mark* of the People of *Israel*, from other *Nations*, as was that of *Circumcision*, the *Pass-over*, and the *Seventh-day-sabbath*, was at an end and to cease when *the partition-wall was broken down* between Jew and Gentile, when Christ had *made both one*, and *abolished in his flesh the Enmity*, (*even the law of Commandments contained in Ordinances*,) *to make of twain One new man; to reconcile both in One body by the Cross, having slain the Enmity thereby*, Eph. 2. 14, 15, 16. Or as it is Col. 2. 14. *Having blotted out the hand-writing of Ordinances which was against us, and was contrary to us*, (as separating us Gentiles from the Jews, and so excluding us out of Gods Visible Church,) *and nailing it to his Cross*. From whence he there infers, *ver.* 16. *Let no man Therefore judge you in meat or drink, or in respect of a holy-day* (a Festival) *or of Sabbaths*, (the proper name, at that time, of the *Seventh-day* Sabbath:) *which things are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ*; these being but *shadows* or empty things, whereas it is the *body*, (the Substance) that Christ regards. ἅ ἐστι σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων, τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, those are but *shadow*, but 'tis the *Body* that Christ looks at. That is (in our language) those are only *Circumstantials*, but 'tis *substance* or the *Substantials* of Religion that *Christ* and *Christianity* respects. And, as it is meerly *Circumstantial* (and doth not at all influence Religion) whether in the *Temple* or other *place* God be worshiped (*Joh.* 4. 21.) So, whether on *this* or *another* day, a Sabbath be kept.

If therefore those Sabbaths (as is shewed) were distinctive *Marks* or *Signs* of Gods peculiar *Covenant* or *Contract* with the Church of *Israel* as *their peculiar God*, in contradistinction to other Nations; then 'tis manifest that those other Nations did not at all keep a *Sabbath*, or not on *that Day*; (else how could this be a distinctive Mark?) and therefore to bring this now upon the Gentiles, was to bring upon them a *new Yoke*.

I add further, that this *Jewish* Sabbath (as is shewed before) seems to be, not a Continuation of a former Sabbath from the Creation, (which I doubt was either not observed at all, or had long

long before this time been forgot,) but rather a New Institution or Restitution after their coming out of *Egypt* (from a new *Epocha*) at *Marah*; where God is said to have *made a Statute and an Ordinance*, Exod. 15. 25. to which *Commandment and Statute if they would hearken diligently and give Ear, he would not bring upon them the Diseases which he had brought upon* Egypt, *For* (saith he) *I am the Lord that healeth thee*, ver. 26. Whereupon follows (in the next Chapter) a *sabbath* to be observed on the *seventh-day* from the first raining of *Manna*, (not from the first Creation.) And with reference to their *Rest* or *Refreshing* after their *Labour* or *Bondage* in *Egypt*; (as was that of the *Pass-over*, to their being *passed-over*, when the first-born of the *Egyptians* were slain.) For so he saith, *Exod.* 31. 13. *My Sabbath shall ye keep, for it is a Sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctifiy you* (or separate you to my self as a peculiar people, a holy people;) and *ver.* 16, 17. *The Children of Israel shall keep my Sabbaths* (σάββατα) *for a perpetual Covenant; It is a Sign between Me and the Children of Israel for ever; for in six days the Lord made Heaven and Earth, and on the Seventh Day he Rested and was Refreshed.* Not that God was *Wearied* with his *Work*, and needed *Refreshment*; but he doth parallel his *Rest* after his *Work* of Creation, with their *Refreshment* after their *Labour* in *Egypt*.

And that God had a particular respect to *their Rest and Refreshment* from their *Labour and Bondage in Egypt*; is farther evident, not onely from the General *Preface* to all the Commandments, (*I am the Lord thy God which brought thee out of the Land of Egypt, out of the house of Bondage*;) but from the Close of this *Fourth* Commandment, as it is repeated in *Deut.* 5. 12, 13, 14, 15. (somewhat different from what is in *Exod.* 20.) where, (instead of *For in six days the Lord made Heaven and Earth*, &c. *Exod.* 20. 11.) we have (*Deut.* 5. 15.) *And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence, through a mighty hand, and a stretched out arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-day.* Which shews that *this* Sabbath, had a particular respect to *that deliverance*.

Now as God by *Moses* did, upon a New occasion (of their Rest from their Labour in *Egypt*) give a New *Epocha* or Beginning to a Circulation of Sabbaths, to be reckoned from thence, in *imitation* of his own Resting from the Work of Creation; Not by the Fourth Commandment (for that speaks indifferently as to any Circulation,) but by this *Ordinance* at *Marah*, or at *Elim* (for 'tis this

no de-

determines the Circulation to the *ſeventh* day after the raining of *Manna*;) So might Chriſt as well (by himſelf or his Apoſtles) fix another *Epocha* from his *Reſurrection*, (as we have reaſon to think he did;) and this Equally within the proſpect of the Fourth Commandment. This *Reſt* from the *Egyptian Bondage*, being as much a *ſhadow*, of what Chriſt regards as the *ſubſtance*, as was the eſcaping of the Egyptian *Deſtruction*, of which the *Paſs-over* was the Memorial. And accordingly this *Circulation* equally to ceaſe with that of the Paſs-over, at the coming of Chriſt; notwithſtanding the continuance of the *Fourth Commandment*, in a *New* Circulation from another *Epocha*. It is not indeed *expreſly ſaid* that Chriſt *Bid* his *Apoſtles* ſo to do: But as *Moſes* is preſumed to do what he did by *Gods* direction; ſo the *Apoſtles* by *Chriſts* direction; to whom he gave *Commandments* for that purpoſe, *Act.* 1. 2, 3.

As to what he ſays ſo often; that not one *Jott* or *Tittle* of the *Law* (meaning that of the Decalogue) is *deſtroyed*, but doth ſtill continue in force: This, as to the *ſubſtance of the Duty*, I grant. But if his meaning be, that there is not a *Word* or *Letter* therein which doth not as *literally* belong to *Us* Now, as it did Then to *Iſrael:* I cannot aſſent to it. For it cannot be ſaid of all Us who are under that Law, that God hath *Brought us out of the land of Egypt, out of the houſe of Bondage;* or that *We* are to expect *long life, in the land* (of Canaan) *which he Gave Them.*

If he ſay that our deliverance from *ſpiritual bondage* is equivalent to theirs from *Egypt*, and *our land* the ſame to us as *Canaan* was to them: I grant it. But ſo is our *Lords Day* equivalent to their *Seventh-day-ſabbath*, and Chriſt the *true Manna* (more than) equivalent to that of theirs, from the *raining* of which they reckoned their *Jewiſh* Sabbaths.

As to what he ſays of *Mat.* 24. 20. *Pray that your flight be not in the Winter, nor on the Sabbath-day*; which he thinks to be underſtood of the *Jewiſh* Sabbath, 38 years after Chriſts Reſurrection. Perhaps it may. For the obſtinate Jews, (who *would not in their day underſtand the things that belonged to their peace*, but rejected Chriſt,) did no doubt continue to obſerve their Jewiſh Sabbath, and thought themſelves obliged ſo to do: And it would then be as great an *Affliction* to them, as if *their* Sabbath were yet in force: But no more a *ſin* to fly on that day, than to fly in the *Winter*. It would be ſo to the *Chriſtians*, if put to flight on the *Chriſtian* Sabbath (for the caſe would be the like of both) and they might as well *Pray againſt it:* That is, Againſt *their* Flight

on

on the *Christian* Sabbath; as the *Jews* on the *Jewish* Sabbath. This therefore makes nothing at all to his purpose. He might as well argue from hence, that it were a *sin* to *labour* in *Winter*, as, on the *Jewish Sabbath*.

He hath many other little excursions, as little to the purpose, with which I shall not trouble my self or you; having fully answered what seems to me to have any appearance of Argument.

But he takes great pleasure to expose the Name of *Sunday*. Yet I do not find any more fond of using it, than he. Not, that he would be thought to *like* the Word, but because he thinks it a *Reproach*. If he do not like that name, he may call it as we do, the *Lords Day*, the *Christian Sabbath*, or (if he think these too good names for it) he may call it the *First day of the Week*.

But why not as angry with the *Monday*, or other of the Week days? If on *Monday* the Heathens (as he would have us think) did worship the *Moon*, as the *Sun* on *Sunday*, why is he not as angry with that? It is as much Idolatry to worship the *Moon* on Monday, as the *Sun* on Sunday, if true. But that doth not concern the *Christians* Sabbath (which is what he hath a mind to reproach) and therefore he speaks little of the other, and but seldome. But *Sunday* is to be nubbed upon every occasion.

He would not have a *Sabbath* upon *Sunday*, because he says, on that day they worshiped the *Sun*. But why upon *Saturday* if on that day (as he would have us think) they worshiped *Saturn*?

Now 'tis true that some of the Heathen did worship the *Sun*, and the *Moon*, and *the Hosh of Heaven*. But that they did worship the *Sun* more upon *Sunday*, than they did upon *Monday* or *Tuesday*, is more than I know, or he can prove. He tells us, *Verstegan* says, that the *Heathen Saxons* did so. But *Verstegan* is too young an Author to settle this upon his own Authority; unless he can bring Vouchers for it more ancient than himself. It was, I suppose, a Fansy of *Verstegan* Then (as it is of our Author Now;) But I do not remember that he cites any Author ancienter than himself. And though some others may say the like; Yet I look upon it but as a *plausible conjecture*, without any good foundation in History. And even the *Heathen Saxons* are too late for his purpose.

He tells us, *p.* 88. *The Heathen Nations long before Christs Birth did offer Sacrifice to the Sun, and worship it as a God upon Sunday.* His proof is from *Job* 31. 26, 27, 28. *If I beheld the Sun when it shined, or the Moon walking in brightness, and my heart hath been secretly enticed, or my mouth hath kissed my hand, this were an iniquity to be punished by the Judges, for I should have denied the Lord above.*

But

But what is all this to Sunday? It may perhaps be a diſclaimer of *worſhiping the Sun*; but ſays nothing of *Sunday*.

Doth our Author think the name of *Sunday* to be as old as *Job*'s times? If *Job* had ſaid, *If I have worſhiped the Sun upon Sunday, or the Moon upon Monday, and not the Lord upon Saturday*; it had been to his purpoſe: But there is nothing of that. Nor a word of *what day* it was on which they worſhiped the Sun.

But I would not have him lay too great a load upon *Sunday*. For *Heſiod* tells us (as was ſaid before) that in his time (one of the oldeſt of the Heathen Writers, though younger than *Job*) the *Seventh* day was *Sun-day*, not the *Firſt*. And he hath nothing to ſhew (more than the bare *Name* of *Sunday*) to make us believe that thoſe of the Heathen, who worſhiped the Sun, did confine that worſhip to *this* day of the Week; or, Did more worſhip it on this day than on others.

I do not certainly know how Ancient thoſe Names are of *Saturday, Sunday, Monday*, &c. nor upon what occaſion they were firſt taken up, (nor is it much to our purpoſe.)

The moſt ancient Heathen Writer whom I know to have mentioned them is *Dio Caſſius*, who lived about the Year of our Lord 230. Who ſpeaking of the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem* and the *Temple*, tells us that the *Jews* had ſuch a reverence for *Saturn's day*, as that they would not *Labour* on that day for their Defence; which the *Romans* underſtanding, did on that day aſſault them, and prevailed. (Againſt their *Temple* and *Sabbath* both at once.) Not as if the *Jews* did then call it *Saturn*'s day, (nor am I ſure that any other did then ſo call it,) for they called it their *Sabbath*-day; But it was that day of the Week which, in *Dio*'s time, was called *Saturday*.

But *Dio* ſpeaks of it as a *new Thing* ſo to call the Days of the Week, and which the *Ancient Greeks* (he tells us) knew not. ('Twas therefore not very Ancient.) And therefore he ſuppoſeth the *Romans* to have taken it up from the *Egyptians*. Not the Old *Egyptians* of *Moſes*'s time, but rather from thoſe about the time of *Ptolomy*; not of King *Ptolomy*, but of *Claudius Ptolomæus* the Aſtronomer (or perhaps ſomewhat earlier) when Aſtronomy there flouriſhed, and from whom the *Romans* had it.

In a Chriſtian Writer, I find it earlier than *Dio*; in *Juſtin Martyr*'s Apology, written about the Year of Chriſt 150, who mentions τὴ ἡλίε ἡμέραν, the *Day of the Sun*, as the Chriſtian Sabbath. And *Tertullian* in his *Apology*, mentions *Saturday* and *Sunday*. And it may perhaps be found in Writers earlier than theſe, Though I do not at preſent meet with it. Nor do I think it worth

worth the while to make any great search about it. I grant, that when Christianity was spread among the Gentiles, and with it, the Christian Sabbath; they did (in order to the observing that Sabbath) distinguish their time into *Weeks*, and thereupon gave Names to each Day. I grant also that the *Jews* did, before, so distinguish their Time: but I do not find that any other Nation did so. If any think, that All nations did so distinguish, and every Nation, all the World over, call the days by those Names by which they are now called: This I take to be but a *Presumption*, without proof.

But when ever those names were first taken up, I do not think they were taken from the *number of their Gods* (for then they must have had a great many more days in their Week than Seven, if each of their Gods must have a peculiar day:) But from the number of the *Planets*, which were then reckoned to be *Seven*, and in this order *Saturn*, *Jupiter*, *Mars*, *Sol*, *Venus*, *Mercury*, *Luna*. Though we now know the Planets to be more than Seven. (For the *Satellites* of *Jupiter* and *Saturn* are as much *Planets* as our *Moon*; but were not then known.) Nor were the Seven Planets always reckoned in the same order; but some had been thought to be *above* the Sun, which, before these names were given, were accounted to be *below* it. And therefore these Names must be at least so late. And certainly not so old as *Job*'s time. I take them not to be older than what are called the *Planetary Hours*; but to take their Rise from thence, and the Order of the Names to be thence determined. For having divided the Day into 24 Hours; Beginning with *Saturn*, the highest of the Planets, they assigned to him the *First* hour of one day, which thence they called *Saturn*'s day; the Second hour to *Jupiter*, the Third to *Mars*, and so in order till they came to the Eighth hour which falls to *Saturn*'s turn again, and so again to the Fifteenth, and the Two and Twentieth; and then the Three and Twentieth to *Jupiter*, the Four and Twentieth to *Mars*, and the next hour, being the first of the next day, to *Sol*. Which day doth thence take the name of *Sol* or *Sunday* (next in order after *Saturn*.) And, in like manner proceeding, the Eighth, Fifteenth, and Two and Twentieth hour of that day will fall again to *Sol*, the Three and Twentieth to *Venus*, the Four and Twentieth to *Mercury*; and then the first hour of the next day to *Luna*, thence called *Monday* (next after *Sunday*.) And, in like manner, the first hour of the following day to *Mars*; of the next to *Mercury*; the next to *Jupiter*, the next to *Venus*; and then again to *Saturn*; and so onward as before. And this I

take to be the true account of those Names, and in that Order: *Saturday*, *Sunday*, *Monday*, after which (in the Latine Denomination) follow the days of *Mars*, *Mercury*, *Jupiter*, and *Venus*.

But some of our Ancestors the Saxons, thought fit (as is supposed) to put in the Names of *Twisco*, *Woden*, *Thor*, *Frea*, (some of their Princes) instead of *Mars*, *Mercury*, *Jupiter*, and *Venus*, (as *Julius* and *Augustus*, amongst the *Romans*, gave their Names to the Months formerly called *Quintilis* and *Sextilis*.) From which Saxon Princes we have the Names of *Tuesday*, *Wednesday*, *Thursday* and *Fryday*: the other days retaining the Names of their respective Planets as they did before.

This account (from the order of the Planetary Hours) *Dio* gives us of the *Names* of the Week-days, and of their *Order*. Why so called, and why in this Order.

He tells us of another account from the Principles of *Harmonicks*. Because *Dia-tessaron* (which we call a *Fourth*) is Reputed a *Concord* in Musick; therefore they might, beginning with *Saturn* (skipping two, *Jupiter* and *Mars*,) take the Fourth *Sol*: then (skipping the two next *Venus* and *Mercury*) take *Luna*: And then (skipping *Saturn* and *Jupiter*) take *Mars*: Then (skipping *Sol* and *Venus*) take *Mercury*: Then (skipping *Luna* and *Saturn*) take *Jupiter*: Then (skipping *Mars* and *Sol*) take *Venus*: Then (skipping *Mercury* and *Luna*) take *Saturn*; and so onward as before. But this account seems more *Forced*, and the former more *Natural*. Which therefore I take to be the true ground of this Order.

But either way, depending upon the order of the Planets as they were then accounted when these Names were given to the Week-days, it is at least so far evident that they cannot be older than since the Planets were accounted to be placed in this order. And therefore not so old as when *Venus* or *Mercury* or both of them were thought to be above the *Sun*. (For this would quite disturb the Order.) And therefore, certainly, not so old as *Job*'s time.

Whether on each of these *Days* they did worship those respective *Planets*, as so many *Gods*, I cannot say; nor do I think it.

Nor do I think that each of those *Planets* have any more *Government* of their respective *Hours*, or *Days*, than of others. For I take the whole foundation as well of *These*, as of the other parts of *Judicial Astrology*, to be purely *Precarious*; and assigned onely at pleasure, by those whose business it was to amuse credulous people, and thereby to make a Gain of them.

But,

But, whatever were the occasion of the first imposing, these are now the known Names of those days. (And we need no more scruple the use of these *Names*, than to talk of Pope *Pius*, *Clemens*, *Boniface*, and *Innocent*; though possibly the Persons so called, had none of those good Qualities.) In like manner as we have a Spring near *Oxford* which we call *Aristotle's Well*; not that we think *Aristotle* was ever there, or was *Lord* of the place, and much less that he was wont to be *there Worshiped*; but we so call it as being now the *proper name* of the place (imposed at pleasure) by which it is known. And so for the days of the Week; whatever were the occasion of the first imposing, they now signify no more than the proper distinctive names by which the days are known.

And why we may not continue so to call them, I know not. We are told *Act.* 17. 19, 22. of *Paul's* being at *Areopagus* or *Mars-hill*, because that was the known name of the place, without scrupling the reason why it was so called (whether, because *Mars* had been there worshiped, or for what other reason.) And *Act.* 28. 11. a *Ship* designed by *Castor* and *Pollux*, or *Διόσκουροι*, without scrupling the reason of that name, or what relation these Stars had to *Jupiter*, so as to be called *his Lads*. And when *Paul* 1 *Cor.* 8. allows them without Scruple to *eat of things offered in Sacrifice to Idols*, even though they knew, or had reason to presume them so to be, (unless when they might be suspected to do it with respect to the Idol) as the Apostle argues at large 1 *Cor.* 8. and again *Chap.* 10. No doubt we may as lawfully make use of proper Names (whereby persons, times, or places be commonly known) without scrupling the occasion of their first imposition.

And I would desire those Gentlemen (who are so over scrupulous where there is no just occasion, and make it their business to throw Scruples and cast Stumbling-blocks before others,) to consider seriously, whose Work they be doing all that while, and whether it be not as truly and properly *superstition* to represent and quarel with things as unlawful and sinful, which in their own nature are not so; as it is to introduce things under a pretence of *holiness* which have in them no such thing. And whether this be not to *dote about questions and strife of words*? Whether these be not of those *foolish and unlearned questions* which we are advised to *avoid; knowing that they gender strifes*, and to *avoid foolish questions, and genealogies and contentions about the law, for they are unprofitable and vain*; and instead thereof to mind those things that are *good and profitable to men*; *to follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace*, &c. as we are directed, 1 *Tim.* 6. 4, 5. 2 *Tim.* 2. 22, 23. *Tit.* 3. 8, 9.

They do not consider how much the studying and prosecuting these *foolish questions*, and needless Scrupulosities, doth eat out the *power of Godliness*, and true Piety, and the *substantials* of Religion, while we busy ourselves about these *shadows*; about little *circumstances* which do not at all influence the Substance of *spiritual* Worship.

There be so many *necessary duties*, and *indubitable truths*, in the serious practise of *Piety and Godliness*, that we need not trouble the heads of men (and make it our business so to do) with *doubtful disputations*.

It seems to be the design of the New Testament to take us off from the *Circumstantials* and *Scrupulosities* of Religion (which commonly produce strifes and contentions to no purpose) and put us upon *worshiping God in Spirit and in Truth*.

Si Deus est Animus, nobis ut carmina dicunt,
Hic tibi precipue sit pura Mente colendus.

Was well enough said of the Poet; and is a good Paraphrase on that, *God is a Spirit and will be worshiped in Spirit and in Truth*. I have been told long since of a Grave Divine, who when asked, Why he did not Preach against *Long hair* (which was at that time more Offensive than now it is,) gave this Answer; If he could but Preach Jesus Christ into their *Hearts*; he should not much concern himself for their *Hair*.

This Author tells us, *p.* 49. *that our Liberty* Gal. 5. 1. *doth eminently consist in a Freedome not onely from the Ceremonial Law of old, but also in a Liberty not to be intangled with a new yoke of mens devices*. I take *needless Scrupulosities* to be such; the making of more Sins than God hath made; the making or pretending of those things to be Sins which are no sins, and putting a *religious Necessity* upon things which are matters of meer *Prudence* and *Discretion*. Like those 1 *Tim.* 4. 3. *Forbidding to Marry*, or (as I would rather render it) *Bidding not to Marry; and, to abstain from Meats*, &c. Forbidding things as *Unlawful* which are not so; is alike Superstitious as to Impose things as *holy* which are not Holy: and equally contrary to the *Liberty* there intended.

Whether the days be called *Saturday*, *Sunday*, *Monday*, or *Alpha*, *Beta*, *Gamma*, is all one to me, (I take them as I find them:) I think we ought not to foment quarels upon such trifles; and we sin if we do so.

Whether to meet once, or twice, or thrice, on a Sabbath-day, (if so as is most for edification and the real service of God,) is meerly pru-

prudential in this or that place, without laying a new *religious yoke* where God leaves it to Prudence. And if in *Prudentials*, things be not managed sometimes with so much Prudence as we think they might, we must be content to bear with such *Imprudences* as we cannot help; and better so, than to pull on greater Inconveniences.

Whether to begin the Sabbath at Six or Ten or Twelve a Clock on Saturday-night, is a thing (I think) not worth contending about, (so that it be religiously observed as to the Substantials of it,) and for which we ought not to disturb the Church where we live; but to *follow righteousness, charity, peace; and avoid foolish questions which gender strife.*

And I should not think it much more, whether *on this or that day*, do the Sabbath be well kept: and I would by no means, on that account, give a disturbance to a Church where it is peaceably setled. 'Tis less material *When*, than *How*, a Sabbath be kept. And, in many cases, it must be unavoidably left to Prudence, whether this or that day be called the *First* or *Seventh* day of the Week. We are in such cases to study *the things that make for Peace*, and *wherewith one may edify another*. Rom. 14. 19. (The fruits of the *spirit* are *love, joy, peace*, &c. but *variance, emulation, wrath, strife*, are *fruits of the flesh*. Gal. 5. 20, 21.

To study and spin out Disputes into too fine a Thread (like that of a Spider out of her own Bowels) is but *to pervert* the Simplicity of the *Gospel of Christ*; to make that *Abstruse* and *Difficult*, which the Scripture would have *Plain* and *Easy*, in *Speculatives* as well as *Practicals*. We should mind the *substantials* of *spiritual worship*; and not dote upon *circumstantials* further than as they do really advance the Substance. *Refuse profane and old wives fables, and exercise thy self rather unto Godliness; for bodily exercise profiteth little*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 7, 8. Such are those *Col.* 2. 20, 21. *Touch not, taste not, handle not*, (and others of like nature) *all which perish in the using*, (there is no real advantage doth accrew from the use of them; 'tis but labour lost;) or ἃ ἐστι πάντα εἰς φθορὰν τῇ ἀποχρήσει *they are but mischievous in their use.*

We complain of the Papists (and deservedly) for *loading* their Worship with a *multitude* of *Ceremonies* and mimical *Gestures*; the *number* of which would be a *Burthen*, even though *singly* they were Tolerable. Being so many *Diversions* of the mind from Attending the *spirituality* of the Service. But *they* have some reason for it. For when much of their Devotion is either to be spoken so *low* as not to be *Heard*, or in such a *Language* as not to be *understood*,

stood, they have need of somewhat to gratify the *Eye*, when the *Ear* is not *Edified*.

And it is almost the same mischief, when mens Minds are amused with Nice Speculations and needless Scrupulosities, whereby they are Diverted from the Substantials of Serious Religion.

Yet I would not so be understood, as if no care were to be had of *Corporeal* Worship, or the necessary Circumstances attending it. (For God expects the Worship of the Body as well as the Soul, and *Religious* Actions must have their *Circumstances*, as Time, Place, Gesture, and the like, as well as other *Actions*.) But these *Circumstantials* should be considered as *Circumstances* (not as the *substance* of the Worship;) and as *Prudentials*; so to be managed (as in all other actions) as may, with Decency and Convenience, best advance the *spiritual* Worship; and may be varied according as the diversity of times and places may require. Not to lay the Weight of *Divine Institution* upon such little things. As if, because *Paul Kneeled down and Prayed* (*Act.* 20. 36.) therefore it were unlawful to use any other *Gesture* in Praying; Or as if, because Christ bids, *when thou Prayest, enter into thy Closet and shut the door* (Mat. 6. 6.) therefore we may not pray in the Chamber, Parlour, Dining-Room, or Chappel: Or, because Christ did Celebrate the Lords Supper, at *Night*, in an *Upper-room*, to *Men* onely, and but *Twelve*, and to those *Sitting* or *Lying*; therefore we may not do it at *Noon* or *Morning*, in a *Low-room*, to *Women* as well as Men, in greater *Numbers*, or in some other *Gesture*. For though such *Circumstances* may be *Lawful*, and sometimes *Advisable* when *convenient*; yet to put a *Religious Necessity* upon them, as of *Divine Institution*, looks like a piece of *Superstition*.

And if we consider seriously how great a mischief many times some needless Scruples do create to the Church of God; *how great a matter a little fire kindles*; and how great hindrance to real Piety; it might justly make us wary how we add Fewel to such a Flame, and rather bear with some things *we think* amiss, (but may perhaps not be so) than by attempting to remove a suppos'd Evil create a greater Mischief.

As to the present point in question; I have said so much upon the whole, as I think might satisfy the Gentleman if he well consider it. Yet I know, when men have once espoused a notion of which they are fond; and have so long pored upon it as to rivet it in their mind; catching at every little thing that may seem to favour it, and slighting whatever makes against it; (as we find our Author doth very often;) And that hardly any thing

thing can be ſaid ſo *plain*, as that there be nothing to be *cavilled* at, by one who is minded ſo to do: And that when God hath declared his will as plainly as he thinks *fit* to do, if men will not be contented with reaſonable evidence, he is not obliged to gratify their humours.

When (I ſay) we conſider this; It looks ſomewhat like what *Solomon* tells us *Prov.* 18. 19. of a *Brother offended*, harder to be won *than a ſtrong City*; and I muſt leave the ſucceſs to God, who *ſo teacheth as none like him.*

He remits us to two Writers on this Subject, in defenſe of the Chriſtian Sabbath, Mr. *Shepheard* and Mr. *Hughs* (whom I have not read, nor have them at hand,) and Two others whom he names not (not know I well whom he means, for more than two have ſince written;) who, he thinks, do tacitly retract ſomewhat that thoſe before had granted. And divers others have written on this Subject, though I have ſcarce conſulted any of them. And particularly I have not ſeen what is written by Dr. *Young* or Mr. *Warren*, whom I find cited in a late Book of *G. T.* which came out ſince this was Written and part of it printed. It is very poſſible, that ſome of thoſe may have ſaid much of what I now ſay; or that I may now ſay ſomewhat of what they have ſaid before. But, in this, there is no hurt. If in ſome particulars I vary from ſome of them; it is not becauſe I ſlight them, or out of a deſire to contradict them; but freely to ſpeak my own thoughts as they do theirs. Nor is it to be expected that all Writers on the ſame Subject ſhould agree in every particular, (Nor is he to make advantage of it; For *p.* 3. he owns it is ſo alſo with *thoſe who are for the ſeventh day*:) But as to the main (I preſume) we do well enough agree.

I have been a great deal longer than I did intend when I firſt began to write.

I ſhall give you a brief Summe of what I have ſaid to this purpoſe, as to both Queſtions. (For the Queſtion is double, though it ſeem to be but one.)

Firſt concerning the *Jewiſh Sabbath*, Whether that be Antiquated and at an end. Secondly, concerning the *Chriſtian Sabbath*, Whether there be ſufficient ground for this to ſucceed in the place thereof.

As to the firſt; I agree with him in many things which he proſecutes at large, though not peculiar to his Queſtion; As, That *Our Lord Jeſus Chriſt* is *God*; that he is the Lord *Jehovah*, the God who *made the World*, who *reſted the ſeventh day*, who *brought*

brought Israel out of Egypt, and *gave the Law on Mount Sinai*: For there is *one other God*.

But, this I say, he did *as God* (in Union with the Father and Holy Ghost;) not as *Christ* (God and Man) our *Mediator* and *Redeemer*. For he was not *then* Man; nor was there occasion of a Mediator and Redeemer before the fall.

I agree also that the Decalogue (or Ten Commandments) is Obligatory to us Gentiles; (as being for the substance of it, a Law before it was so delivered on Mount *Sinai*.) And that the Fourth Commandment concerning the Sabbath is one of them; which requires after *six days* of Labour, the *seventh* day to be a *Sabbath* or day of *Holy Rest*. (And our *Christian Sabbath* is such.

But it doth not say, *the seventh in course from the Creation*, nor doth it appear that the *Jewish* Sabbath was such, but rather the Seventh day from the *first raining of Manna*.

I do agree also that *God himself* did rest on the Seventh day from the Creation, *Gen.* 2. that is, He did *cease* to *Create*.

But I do not there find, that *Man* did so rest, or that there was any *express command* for him so to do on that day; much less for ever after, on every Seventh day in course from the Creation. How much may be thought to be *implyed* in those words, he *blessed and sanctified it*, I will not dispute; However, it is but by *Implication* not by any *express command*; such as our Author demands for the Christian Sabbath.

Nor do I find that ever it was observed by *Man* till after the *Israelites* coming out of *Egypt*, or *expressly commanded* so to be.

Nor do I find that any *other Nation* (beside the Jews) did anciently so much as divide their time by *Weeks*. Since the times of Christianity they have: But that they did so, long before that time, I do not find.

I do agree also that after *Israels* coming out of *Egypt* they did observe a *Sabbath*, Exod. 16.

But it was from a *new command*, (at *Marah* or *Elim*) which appeared *New* to them, not a continuation of a constant practise; and it was from a *new beginning* (the Seventh day from the first raining of *Manna*,) and as a *distinctive sign* or *token*, of Gods being their *God* in a special manner, as contradistinguished to other nations; (as himself owns *p.* 26. and 28.) and as a memorial of their *Refreshing* after their *Bondage* and *Labour* in *Egypt*, and feeding them with *Bread from Heaven*.

I do presume also that, they did, from this first raining of *Manna* continue a circulation of *Weeks* for a long time, and perhaps till the time of our *Saviour*.

Yet

Yet we are not sure but that it might be intermitted in the *seventy years* of the *Babylonish* Captivity, and the day forgotten; and then restored a-new by *Nehemiah* (from a new beginning) *Neh.* 13. as he restored the *Feast of Tabernacles* (Chap. 8.) which had been intermitted *from the days of Joshua the son of Nun to that day*. But I rather think, the memory was preserved (by Tradition) during those *seventy years*.

I agree also that the Church of the Jews was the *most* visible Church of God, but I am loth to say (with him, *p.* 79.) it was *the whole visible Church*; For I presume there might be many *Good men* of other Nations, who worshiped the *true God* (of whom we have no History,) though not joined to the Jewish Church, nor were (that I know of) obliged so to be. Such was *Melchizedek* (whoever he were) not of the seed of *Abraham*, much less of *Israel*. And such was *Job*, and his *Friends* from divers Countries (of whom, were it not for the story of *Job*, we should have had no knowledge,) nor are we to think these were the *onely persons* of those Countries who worshiped the true God. And how many such were in other Nations, we cannot tell. Who might, if they had opportunity, join as *Proselites* with the *Jewish* Church, when established. But I do not think they were *necessarily obliged* so to do, or to keep the *same Sabbath* with them.

For I take it to be true, even before Christs coming, that *God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation, he that feareth him and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.* Act. 10. 34, 35. *Whether Jew or Greek*, Rom. 2. 10, 11. 1 Pet. 1. 17. Which are but Quotations from *Deut.* 10. 19.

Nor do I find that any Nation, except the *Jews*, did observe the *Jewish* Sabbath. But I rather take it to be a *distinctive sign* of them from other Nations, *Ex.* 31. 13, 17. as *Circumcision* and the *Pass-over* were; which, when the *wall of partition* was taken away, ceased also.

Yet, as to what was Moral in them (the *Circumcision of the heart* being pointed at by that of the *Flesh*; and the *old leaven of malice and wickedness* to be put away instead of that of *Bread*; and a *rest from Sin* of more respect with God than that from *Labour*;) we have instead thereof, *Baptism*, in the room of *Circumcision*; the *Lords Supper*, in the room of the *Pass-over*; and the *Lords Day* or *Christian Sabbath*, instead of the *Jewish*. And, as that took date from the raining of *Manna* after their deliverance from *Egypt*; so ours from the *Resurrection of Christ*, the true *Manna*.

I agree also that the *Apostle*, and other *Christians*, even after Christs Resurrection, did go to the *Temple* and the Jewish *Synagogues* on their

Sabbath days (and did there assist at *Prayers*, and *Reading the Law*, and other services common to Jews and Christians) on a like account as when we now meet to *hear a Sermon*, or keep a *Fast* or *Thanksgiving* on a *Week-day*.

But so they did as to *Circumcision*, and other *Jewish Rites*. As when *Paul* circumcised *Timothy*, and joined in the Jewish Rites of *Purification*, Act. 21. on account of those *believing Jews* who were yet *zealous of the Law*: To testify to them that he had been misrepresented by those who said he did teach *the Jews which are among the Gentiles* to *forsake Moses*, and that they *ought not to circumcise their Children, nor to walk after the Customs*. Whereas indeed he taught that *Gentiles* ought so to forbear, (as being a *new yoke* to which before they were not subject,) but as to the *Jews which were amongst the Gentiles* he did allow them (if not yet satisfied of their Christian Liberty) so to practise. For he puts a great difference between the *Gentiles*, and the *Jews among the Gentiles*; of which I doubt our Author doth not take notice; else he would not tell us (*p.* 39.) of *Paul's writing one thing, and practising another*. He preached and wrote *against Circumcision* as to the *Gentiles*; but allowed it to the *Jews*; and himself practised it, As to *Timothy* (a Jew) but not as to *Titus* who was *no Jew*. And the like we may say as to the *Jewish Sabbath* on *their* Seventh day.

As to what Services were peculiarly *Christian* (as *breaking of Bread*) they did it not at the Temple or Synagogues, but κατ' οἶκον *at home*, or *from house to house*, Act. 2. 46. and on another day, the *first day of the Week*, Act. 20. 7.

Now this is all that he hath to urge, for the *Jewish* Sabbath in particular: which he cannot shew to be commanded to *all the World* (but rather to them in particular in contradistinction to the rest of the World,) nor that it was a *Seventh day from the Creation*, but from the first raining of *Manna*. For the Fourth Commandment saith nothing of *this Sabbath* in particular, but onely of the *seventh* day after *six days of labour*.

As to that Imperious demand, *p.* 40,48,64. *Where is there any such Power recorded in Scripture to be given to any Man or Men whatsoever, after Christ had said It is finished, to alter the Seventh-day Sabbath instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ?* I doubt he hath forgotten that the *same God* who gave the Law of the *Ten Commandments*, gave also the *Ceremonial Law*; and if it were *the Lord Jesus Christ* who gave the one, it was he that gave the other also. And will he then ask *Where is there any power recorded in scripture to be given to any man or number of men to abolish* Circumcision and the rest of the Mosaick Rites *insti-*

instituted by the Lord Jesus Christ? I know no such power *recorded in Scripture to be given* as to *Circumcision* and the rest, more than as to the *Jewish Sabbath.* And we find them both put together *Col.* 2. 11, 16. Or will he say, *Where is any Power recorded in Scripture to be given to any Man or Men, (after Christ had said It is finished,)* to appoint Elders and Deacons and other Officers in the Christian Church, and give Orders concerning it, which Christ (before he so said,) had not given? Yet we know *Circumcision* was abolished, and such *Officers* and *Orders* given. So that all this is but Flourish.

As to that of Christ having said *It is finished*; whatever be meant by that, we know that the whole Order and Constitution of the Christian Church was settled after that time. And whatever else be signified by it, it is not meant that there was nothing to be done further concerning it; For, if so, to what purpose did Christ *give Commandments to his Apostles, of things pertaining to the Kingdome of God* after his Resurrection, if nothing were to be further done?

And if we consider the Apostles deportment; We do not find them any where insist *Authoritatively* upon a *Power* given them from Christ, to *Abrogate Circumcision* or the like, and thereupon to proceed *pro imperio.* But they *Argue* it from the nature of the thing, That what was *Typical* of Christ, was at an end now *Christ is come*; That what was *Distinctive* of the Jews from other Nations, was now to cease when *the partition wall was broken down*; That what were but *shadows* as to the *Substantials* of Religion, were now to pass away, as *beggarly Rudiments*, Christ regarding the *Body* or *Substance* not the *Shadows*; ἀλλὰ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, these are but *shadows* in comparison of what Christ came to settle, τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, *but 'tis the Body* (the Substance) *that Christ respects*, Col. 2. 17.

They do not *Command*, but *Argue*. They do no where pretend that God or Christ had given them Authority to *Abrogate a Law* which God had made: But Argue (from the nature of the thing) that the *Law was ceased*; and was not intended to Oblige longer: That the Law was now *Antiquated* or *Expired* when the End for which it was made was attained: That the *Types* were at an *End*, when the Thing *Typified* was Exhibited: That the *Distinctive Marks* were now no more of Use, when Jews and Gentiles were *United*: That the *Elements* or *Rudiments* (στοιχεῖα) which God (for reasons best known to himself) thought fit for the *Training up* of his Church while as in a State of *Minority* (wherein a *Child* though *Heir of all*, doth little differ from a *Servant*) should now cease when it comes to *full Age*, Gal. 4. And to the same purpose *Heb.* 8. He argues that the *Old Covenant* was at an end when a *Better Covenant* was come in

the room; citing that of *Jer.* 31. *Behold the days come, ſaith the Lord, when I will make a New Covenant with the houſe of Iſrael and with the houſe of Judah: Not according to the Covenant which I made with their Fathers when I led them out of the land of Egypt, For this is the Covenant that I will make, That I will put my laws into their Mind, and write them in their Hearts.* Meaning, inſtead of an outward Ceremonial Service, he would eſtabliſh a ſervice more Spiritual. From whence he concludes the *Antiquation* of the Former: *In that he ſaith a New Covenant, he hath made the firſt Old. Now that which Decayeth and waxeth Old, is ready to Vaniſh away.* They do not claim a *Power*, to *Aboliſh a Law of Gods making*; But prove by *Argument*, that theſe Laws are *Antiquated* or *Expired*; as not being intended, by the Law-maker, to bind longer than till ſuch a time. As *Rom.* 7. *The Woman is bound by the Law to her Husband as long as he lives; But if the husband be Dead, ſhe is free from the Law:* Not that *the Law is Aboliſhed*; but *the Caſe is Altered.*

And it is from theſe Conſiderations that he *Argues* againſt *Circumciſion* Col. 2. 11. and the *Jewiſh Sabbath*, ver. 16. For as to the *Subſtantials* of the Service, provided a Sabbath be duly kept, it is much one whether on the *Seventh* or the *Firſt* day. Now theſe (Subſtantials) are (he tells us *p.* 83.) *a lively ſpiritual Converſe with the Father, Son and Holy-Ghoſt, in private Duties and publick Ordinances (where they can be had,) and in a Holy Reſt all that day, ſaving emergent caſes of Neceſſity and Mercy.* Which may be equally done on either day.

But as to thoſe who were not ſatisfied with theſe *Arguments*; (if they were ſuch as were before under thoſe Commands) he doth not urge his *Authority*; He leaves them to practiſe according to their own judgment (but without cenſuring others) till they ſhall be better ſatisfied, as in *Rom.* 14. But as to the *Gentiles*, who had never been under theſe Laws, the caſe was otherwiſe. Which makes him argue otherwiſe with the (Gentile) *Galatians*, *Epheſians*, and *Coloſſians*, than with the Chriſtian *Jews* at *Rome*.

And as to his Queſtion, *p.* 47. *When, where, and by whom*, it was taken away, I ſay *Then, there, and by the ſame*, who took away *Circumciſion* and the other *Moſaick* Rites. That is, *Fundamentally* by *Chriſt* at his death *who nailed them to his Croſs*, after which they ceaſed to be Obligatory; But *Executively* and *Practically* by his Apoſtles, and the Chriſtian Church, according as they did (leiſurably and in time) come to underſtand their Liberty.

All which we are to preſume they did according to ſuch directions as Chriſt gave them. For (as this Author obſerves *p.* 80.) *Paul,*

in

in those Primitive times, when the Ceremonial Law was fresh in memory, and the Gospel newly preached, had much a do to remove the first converted Jews from Circumcision and other Ceremonials, (and so from their *Jewish Sabbath*;) therefore these things were to wear off by degrees, and not to be *torn from them* all at once.

And this I think is enough (to a person not prejudiced) as to the *Removal of the* (then) *Jewish Sabbath*; appointed by *Moses* after their coming out of *Egypt*, on the *seventh day* from the *first raining of Manna*, and not given to *all the world*, but to be a *distinctive sign* of them from other Nations.

Now as to the other Point in Question, the *Observation of the Lords day*: I would ground that originally on the *Fourth Commandment*; which doth appoint a *Seventh day of Holy Rest*, after *Six days of Ordinary Labour*. Which doth directly concern the *Substantials* of Worship (that a Sabbath be kept and God thus served), but whether on this or that day of the Seven, is meerly Circumstantial, and (as *Paul* calls it) a *Shadow*, in comparison of the *Body* or *Substance*, which is, he tells us, what *Christ* respects.

But then as to that, Why the *First day* rather than another? I answer, First, Here was a much more memorable Accident, of *Christs Resurrection*, than was that of *Raining Manna*, from whence the Jewish Sabbath takes its date, as the Seventh day from it (not from the Creation) or that of the *Quails*, the Night before, (the first day that God fed them by Miracle from Heaven.) And therefore stands as fair for beginning such a Circulation of Weeks and Sabbaths.

We are told *Jer.* 16. 14, 15. and *Jer.* 23. 7, 8. *Behold the days come (saith the Lord) that it shall no more be said, The Lord liveth that brought up the Children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; But, The Lord liveth that brought up the Children of Israel out of the North Country.* Not, that the former deliverance was to be forgotten; but a greater than it did make it (comparatively) to disappear (as when the light of the Sun doth obscure that of the Moon and Stars;) And so here, the *Resurrection of Christ* to be commemorated paramount to that of former Mercies.

Next, in pursuance of this Occasion, we find our Saviour did on that day of his *Resurrection*, appear to *Mary Magdalen* and the other Women, declaring to them the *Doctrine of the Resurrection*; then, to the two Disciples going to *Emmaus*, *Preaching* to them (at large) the same Doctrine, and Celebrating with them the *Lords Supper*; and afterward (the same day) to those assembled at *Jerusalem* (with other Sabbatical works) and solemnly *Blessing* that Convention. And if our Author by *blessing the Seventh day* Gen. 2. would have us understand

ſtand an *Inſtitution* or *Command to obſerve it*. We have as much here; Chriſt *joined* in this Aſſembly, and *Bleſſed* it. For ſo much is intimated in that his ſolemn *Benediction* (a firſt and ſecond time, *Joh.* 20. 19, 21.) *Peace be unto you; and he Breathed on them ſaying, Receive ye the Holy Ghoſt.*

He did ſo a ſecond time on the ſame day the next Week; he *Aſſembled* with them (in Religious Services) and *Bleſſed* them.

He did (according to his Promiſe made on that Firſt day of his Reſurrection) ſend on them that miraculous *Effuſion of the Holy Ghoſt* on the day of *Pentecoſt*, which being the Fiftieth day from his Reſurrection, was therefore the *firſt day of the week* as was that of the Reſurrection. On which day of Pentecoſt we find them alſo otherwiſe exerciſed in Religious Employments, and atteſted further by a miraculous converſion of *three thouſand ſouls.*

We find St. *Paul* at *Troas* Act. 20. *Preaching to the Diſciples aſſembled* (as it ſeems their manner was) *on the firſt day of the week to break bread*, that is, to celebrate the *Lords Supper.*

That ſuch Aſſemblies were wont to be at *Corinth*, *on the firſt day of the Week*, the Apoſtle preſumes, or takes for granted; and gives direction for a *Collection* to be then made, 1 *Cor.* 16.

And he had ſo done before, as he there ſignifies, to the *Churches of Galatia*; preſuming or taking for granted, that they alſo did ſo uſe to meet on the firſt day of the Week.

And we have no reaſon to doubt but that ſuch Meetings were wont to be in other Churches. We cannot doubt but that other of the Apoſtles did diſperſe themſelves in other parts of the World, though we have not a like account of their Travels, as we have of *Paul's* recorded by St. *Luke*: But we are to preſume (though it be not recorded) that their Doctrine and Practiſe was conſonant to his; and that accordingly they had ſuch weekly meetings on the Lords Day as theſe Churches had of whom we have the Hiſtory.

Hence that day had the name given of *the Lords day*, κυριακὴ ἡμέρα, as we find it called *Rev.* 1. 10. (as that of the Sacrament is called δεῖπνον κυριακὸν *the Lords Supper*, 1 *Cor.* 11. 20.) which name it retaineth to this day, and for ſuch purpoſe.

And all this, I think, is ſufficient for us to continue our Obſervation of the ſame day. I am ſure 'tis much more than he can ſhew for his *ſeventh-day Sabbath* for more than *two thouſand five hundred years* from the firſt Creation.

It is not neceſſary that we have *expreſs words of Command* Recorded. We have no *Record* in Scripture of ſuch *expreſs words of Command* for the *Seventh-day Sabbath*, till after *Iſraels coming out of Egypt*; nor

not for the *Worshiping of God by Sacrifice*; but for other things which yet were *Duties* before any *Record* of such express words of *Command*. It is enough if we can otherwise Collect it to be Gods Will, according to the best light we have.

If this Gentleman think himself obliged to keep the Jewish Sabbath *also*, this doth not hurt us. This, I think, was the case of the *Christian Jews* at first. I do not much question but that they did, as other Christians, observe the Lords Day. The doubt was, whether they were not to observe *also* the Jewish Sabbath as before they did. And these *Believers*, who were yet *zealous of the Law*, and thought themselves obliged, *together with Christianity*, to observe the *Law of Moses*, did no doubt think themselves equally obliged to the *Jewish Sabbath*. Those who thought themselves obliged to be *Baptized*, and *to be Circumcised also*, thought themselves in like manner obliged to observe the *Lords day* and also the *Jewish Sabbath*. And (till they should be better satisfied) the Apostles permit (*the Jews*) so to do.

If this do not satisfy him, I have yet two Expedients for him.

1. Let him begin his *Week* on *Monday*, and then *Sunday* will be the *Seventh day*. Whether the Seventh in course *from the Creation*, I cannot tell; nor can any Man living inform me. But it will at least be the *Seventh* day of *His* Week.

2. If he be not satisfied with this: My next Expedient is thus. Let him take a Voyage round the World, as Sir *Francis Drake* did. Going out of the *Atlantick Ocean* West-ward by the Streights of *Magellan* to the East-Indies; and then, from the East, returning by the *Cape of Good Hope* (the usual way) homeward. And take with him as many as please of those who are of his mind. And let them keep their *Saturday-Sabbath* all the way. When they come home to *England*, they will find their *Saturday* to fall upon our *Sunday*; and they may thenceforth continue to observe their *Saturday-Sabbath* on the same day with us. Which is the second Expedient.

If you ask, How this can be? I will make it very plain, that so it *will* be, and so it *must* be. For, Supposing the Earth to be Round, and the Sun moving from East to West; you must allow that it comes sooner to the Eastern parts than to the Western. It will sooner be *Noon* in *Holland* than in *England*, and sooner here than in *Ireland*.

If you ask, How much sooner? We say, that *Fifteen Degrees* of Longitude West-ward, makes it an *Hour* later. As if he Embark about *Dover*, *Yarmouth*, or other Port on the East-side of *England*, and Sail as far West-ward as the West of *Ireland* (or a little farther) it will be an *Hour* later, and not be *Noon* there till it be *One* a Clock

at

at the place where he Embarked. And so in proportion, an *Hour* for every *Fifteen degrees*. And accordingly, when he hath gone round the whole Circle of *Three hundred and Sixty Degrees*, (that is Four and twenty times Fifteen,) it will be later by *Four and twenty* hours. That is, it will be but *Saturday-noon* with him, when it is *Sunday-noon* with those who staid here. That is, His *Saturday* will be Our *Sunday*. And thenceforth his *Saturday-Sabbath* will be the same day with our *Sunday-Sabbath* ever after.

And this I think should fully satisfy him. For he tells us, *p.* 39. *The variety of the time of the Sun-rising or setting in different Climates doth no way disturb; for that a day longer or shorter is still a day, and but a day.* Most certain it is he who shall have thus Sailed round the World will have had one day fewer than those who staid here. So it was with Sir *Francis Drake* and his Company: And so it hath been with all who have taken such a Voyage, (as many have done, for it is not a rare case:) and so will be to any who shall so do.

What he would resolve upon this case, or what he thinks Sir *Francis Drake* was to do when this happened; I cannot tell.

If he would go on to reckon the days according as they had happened to him in his Voyage; then this Expedient must fully satisfy him. For then he keeps his *Saturday-Sabbath* on our *Sunday*.

If he thinks the account should be rectified when or before he comes home, and call the days thenceforth as he finds those to do that staid here, what shall become of that day he hath lost? and which day of the Week shall he reckon that to be?

And When must he rectify that account? when he comes home, or somewhere by the way? For it would be just the same, if, before he come at *England*, he should have landed in *France* or *Spain*, or on the Coast of *Africk*, or even at the *East-Indies*; and all the way from thence, he would still be a day behind them. And so he would be with every Ship that in his way he should meet with. If he and such other Ship meet at the Isle of St. *Helens* to take fresh water, his *Saturday* will be their *Sunday*; and on which of the two days are they to keep their *Sabbath?* or must they keep it one on the one day, and the other on the other?

If he say that the account is to be rectified by the way (before he comes home) then Where? or When? and by What rule? For when ever he doth so rectify it, he must then begin to call *Sunday* what just before he was to call *Saturday*.

If he say, This must be left to Discretion, when, and where: Then must it be matter of discretion (and not determin'd by the Fourth Commandment) on which of the two days in question the Sabbath shall be kept.

But

But then here will again come in our amazing demand (as p. 46, 86, 87.) *What man or men, without an high Usurpation of the Divine Authority, contrary to the First Commandment shall, with pretended good intentions, assume an authority of their own heads, to appoint* (for this or that place; suppose the *Streights of Magellan*) *what day shall be the Lords holy Sabbath? Who, but our Lord Jesus Christ, that is Lord of the Sabbath, hath power to institute a Sabbath-day? If the Church or any part thereof be once admitted to have such Power, what Bolts or Locks will be strong enough for such a Door, to keep it from letting in upon the Churches of Christ what soever pleaseth those in Power?*

I shall not much trouble my self to answer all this *Warmth*. But (when that is over) if at or near the *Streights of Magellan* (a place, I think, not inhabited, or not by Christian,) a Colony be planted by some from hence, and some from the East-Indies; those who come thither from hence will (according to their account) call that *Saturday*, which those who come thither from the other side will (according to their account) call *Sunday*: Must they have no Sabbath at all? (that's against the Fourth Commandment:) Or must they by consent agree upon the day? (this I should think, if he would give me leave:) Or must they keep it some upon one day some on the other? This I would by no means advise, if it may be avoided: Because it would be a manifest confusion and disorder; And they would not both (if either) be the *Seventh-day* in course *from the Creation*: And which of them is so, is not possible for any man to know. And it would be more for *common Edification* that they do agree upon a common day. And not much matter, whether of the Two.

This Gentleman, if he can consider of it calmly, I am apt to think will be of the same mind; and think it better to have such a Sabbath than none at all; and that the little circumstance, whether on this or that day, should be disregarded in comparison of the *Substantials* of the Duty.

There be many things which the *Word of God* or the *Divine Law* doth determine *in Thesi*, which when *in Hypothesi* they come in practise, will require the intervention of *Prudentials* or *Humane* Laws. The Eighth Commandment says, I must not *Steal*, or take unduly from my Neighbour what is His: But, What is Mine, and what is my Neighbours, will depend much upon Humane Laws; and, what shall be reputed a Trespass on my Neighbours land; or, a forfeiture of his right. The Seventh Commandment says, *Thou shalt not commit Adultery*: But it will depend much upon Humane Law, what shall be reputed a Good Marriage. The Sixth Commandment says *Thou shalt not Kill*: But it will much depend upon Humane Law what shall be re-

puted

pursued Self-defense, or a Just War, or a Forfeiture of Life. The Fifth Commandment requires us to *Honour and Obey our Parents*; But, in many cases, 'tis Humane Law that is to determine, who is to be reputed the Father. If a Widow be left whith Child by a former Husband, and marry another before that Child be born (which sometime happens;) 'twill be a point in Law, not in Divinity, to whether of the Two Fathers this Son shall be Heir. And if my Father require me to part with what Estate is my own, 'twill be a point in Law, how far I am required to obey such a Command. (And the like as to other *Superiours*, as well as *Natural* Parents.) And those Laws which seem Absolute (as *Thou shalt not Kill*, *Thou shalt not Steal*, &c.) Have yet their Tacite *Limitations* implied. For no man doubts but there are cases wherein *to Kill* may be lawful; as in *Self-defense*, in a *just War*, and for *Capital Crimes*; And in such cases, to *take from* our Neighbour what was His. And, notwithstanding the Command of *Honour thy Father and Mother*, or that of *Children obey your Parents in all things*; there may things happen, wherein we are not obliged to do what they bid us. And in all such cases there is room for *Prudence* to interpose. Not, to Abrogate or Repeal a Law of God; But to judge what is the true Intent of that Law. So not withstanding that Command of the Sabbath, *In it thou shall do no manner of work*; yet our Saviour tells us, *The Priests in the Temple profane the Sabbath and are blameless*, and against the Pharisees *superstitious rigour* he argues, not onely from his own Authority (*The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath-day*) But from the *Reason of the Law*, *The Sabbath was made for Man, and not Man for the Sabbath*; and consequently is so to be understood as may be for the *Good of Man* (spiritual and bodily) not for his *Hurt*. And our Author allows the *emergent cases of Necessity and Mercy*; And no man doubts but that if a *House be on Fire*, we may *Labour to quench it*. In all which cases *Prudence* may be *used*, but must not (upon that pretense) be *Abused*. Not as if it were left to our Prudence, whether or no the Law of God shall be Obeyed; But, what is, in such cases, the true *Intendment* of the Law of God, And there needs no other *Locks or Bolts* (as our Author speaks) to confine *Prudence* in such cases, than in all other *Prudential* Acts. So when the Fourth Commandment requires us *to keep holy the Sabath-day*; it may yet, in many cases, depend much upon Prudence or Humane Laws, which day shall be reputed the *Sabbath*. And if this Author tell us, it must be the *Seventh* in course *from the Creation*; We are never a whit the nearer. For though he take great pleasure, on all occasions, to exclaim against *Tradition*; yet he must admit *a great deal of Tradition* to intervene before he can prove this or that day to be a Seventh in course from the Creation.

I am apt to think also, that when he hath well consider'd the case of Sr. *Francis Drake* (and many more since that time, who sailing round the world, as he did, have lost a day,) he will come to one of these two Resolutions: Either that when he comes back to *England* he must continue to call that *Saturday* which on his account was so; (and then his *Saturday-Sabbath* will be the same with our *Sunday*.) Or else that his account must be somewhere rectified in his Voyage by skipping a day; and then and there beginning to call *Sunday* what, just before, he was to call *Saturday*.

Now because there is nothing in Nature to determine where this *must* be; nor is there any thing of divine Institution (that I know of) to determine where it *shall* be; It seems to me to be Prudential, or most rational, (if nothing intervene to counterbalance it,) to be at what we call the *first Meridian*, from whence we reckon the Degrees of Longitude, East-ward, 1, 2, 3, &c. and so onward till we come round to 360, at the same Meridian again; and thence begin to reckon onward 1, 2, 3, &c. as before, for another round.

This first Meridian, in *Ptolemy*'s time, was accounted to be about the Western part of the *African* shore; as being the most Western part of the World then known. Of later times, Geographers have been pleased to remove it more West, about the Islands called *Azores*, or the *Flemish Islands*. But all agree to place it between our *Continent* and that of *America*. And if from that Meridian, from whence we reckon the beginning of Longitude, we reckon also the beginning of Days; then the last of *Saturday* must there end, and the first of *Sunday* must there begin. And therefore at that Meridian the sailers round the World should rectify their account, calling it *Saturday* on the one side of it, and *Sunday* on the other; that being the *latest* of *Saturday*, and the *soonest* of *Sunday*.

He will tell me perhaps, that, by this account, if *We* keep our Sabbath on *Sunday*, those in *New-England* must be said to keep theirs on *Monday*, as being on the other side of that Meridian. And 'tis true, it would so follow. And therefore I did interpose, *if nothing else do intervene to counterbalance it*. And this is what I did at first intimate, as disputable, whether we and they in *New-England* are to be said to keep our Sabbath on the same day.

But it is the same case as to the whole Continent of *America*. And the same resolution will reach all.

And therefore, the thing being once settled by the common consent of all, I would by no means advise to change the day.

For the placing the *first Meridian* is purely *Arbitrary*. It might as well have been placed beyond *America*, (if men had so pleased,

and that *America* had been known in *Probus*'s time) as on this side: (And we might have numbred our Degrees of Longitude Westward, as now we do Eastward:) And may be so reputed now, if men so please (as it is now reputed about 10 or 15 degrees more to the Westward than it was in *Probus*'s days.)

And it is purely *Arbitrary*, where to begin to change the name of the day which is to be so called; whether at the First Meridian, or elsewhere.

And consequently 'tis purely *Arbitrary* or *Discretional*, whether in *America* such day shall be called *Sunday* or *Monday*. There is nothing in the *fourth Commandment*, nor in the *Word of God*, to determine it.

But it so happening, that *America* hath been peopled from *Europe*, traveling Westward from hence (without taking notice that we cross the first Meridian,) we have reckoned the days (and so named them) according as they appeared to those upon their Voyage who went thither. Whereas if it had been peopled (I mean, as to the Christians there) from *Asia* and the *East-Indies* (by people coming thence to the other side of *America*) what there is now called *Sunday*, would (for the like reason) have been called *Monday*: and the Fourth Commandment equally observed either way.

And upon a like account Christians in the *East-Indies*, and in *China* and *Japan*, traveling Eastward from hence thither, do call their days there according as they appeared to fall out to them in the course of their Voyage.

Now 'tis true, that some part of the day which we here call Sunday, is coincident with some part of what is so called in *Japan*, and also some part of our Sunday (though not the same part) is coincident with part of theirs in *America*. But very little of theirs in the East of *Japan*, with theirs in the West of *America*. About Eleven a clock at night in the one (or yet later) before it begins to be one a clock in the morning in the other, (scarce an hour in common) according to our ancient Maps. (Our later Maps make it somewhat more, as if it might be Ten at night in the one, when it begins to be Two in the morning at the other.) Yet these pass for the same *Sunday*. And 'tis well enough so to reckon.

But it is *Prudentially* so: Because the chief Trade and intercourse of *America*, is with *Europe*; not with *Asia*. And therefore it is considered as lying *West* from *Europe*; rather than as *East* from *Japan*. And accordingly it is so placed in our Maps. And though we continue to reckon our *Longitude* as from a Meridian between *US* and *America*, yet the account of our *days* we begin as from a Meridian beyond it, between *America* and *Asia*.

Which

Which is not said to raise *new scruples*, (as if I should advise an alteration of a received computation; which is well enough as it is; and I know not how to mend it:) But to shew there is an unavoidable Necessity of leaving much to *Prudential* considerations, What day shall be reputed *Sunday*, and what the *Sabbath*, in this or that place. And therefore it cannot reasonably be thought the design of the *fourth Commandment* to confine us to such *Circumstantial Niceties*, which do not at all influence the *substantials of Worship*.

The *fourth Commandment* requires the *seventh* day of Holy *Rest*, after *six* days of ordinary *Labour*. But of a Seventh day in course *from the Creation* to be so observed, it saith nothing: Nor is it possible for us to know. The *Jews* observed a *seventh* day in course from the *first raining of Manna*; but I do not know how that concerns us; or, if it did, how we shall know which is that day? (for this Gentleman will not allow *Tradition* to be a good proof.) *We* observe a *seventh* day in course from what (we think) the *Apostles did observe*. If we mistake our reckoning (which I think we do not) it is not a *Culpable* Ignorance; for it is according to the best Light we have. This day we are in *possession* of, and the Christian Church hath so been for *many Hundred* years. And he that would dispossess us of it, must shew a better Title. (The old rule is, *Possidentis potior est ratio.*) To *change* meerly *for change sake*, is Fooliſh. If he would lay a *Divine Necessity* on us to observe the *Jewish Sabbath* from the first raining of *Manna* (if at least that be the day by them observed in our Saviours time;) he must make it clear to us, which is that day (by a better argument, if he can, than *Tradition*:) And, that we are *of necessity obliged* to that day; which was (himself acknowledges) a *distinctive sign* of them from *other Nations*, as *Circumcision* also was. And if *this distinctive mark* (when the *partition wall is* broken down) do as much cease as that did: 'Tis as truly *superstition* now to put a *necessity* upon it, as upon *Circumcision*. Which though the Apostles would, for a while, permit to the Jews; (to whom it had once been a Law) till they should be better satisfied; Yet would by no means allow to the *Gentiles*, to whom it had not before been a Law. And I think the case is just the same of the *Jewish Sabbath* as contradistinguished to the *Lords day*.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CAMBRIDGE

I am

Yours, &c.

FINIS.

A

DEFENSE

OF THE

Christian Sabbath.

In Answer to

A TREATISE of Mr. *Tho. Bampfield*

Pleading for

SATURDAY-SABBATH.

BY

JOHN WALLIS, D.D. And Professor of *Geometry* in the University of *OXFORD.*

OXFORD,

Printed by *L. Lichfield*, and are to be Sold by *Chr. Coningsby*, at the Golden *Turks-Head* over against St. *Dunstan's* Church in *Fleet-street*, *LONDON.* 1692.

Imprimatur,

JONATH. EDWARDS,
Vice-Can. OXON.

Sep. 17°.
1692.

A DISCOURSE Concerning The Christian Sabbath.

SIR, June 12. 1692.

I Had a while since a Book sent me by the Carrier (I know not well from whom) of Mr. *Thomas Bampfield*, which in the Title-Page, is said to be *Printed for the Author*——1692. It is Concerning the *Sabbath*. Which he thinks should rather be Observed on what we call *Saturday*, than on what we call *Sunday*.

I should not, on this Account, give any Disturbance to the Peace or Practise of the Church where I live, so that a Sabbath be duly Observed as to the *Substantials* of it, though perhaps not upon what day I should chuse.

For I do not know, and I believe no man living can tell me, whether what we now call *Sunday*, be a *First*, a *Second*, a *Third*, or a *Seventh* day, in a continued Circulation of *Weeks* from the *Creation*. And what it is impossible for me to know, I think will be no Crime to be Ignorant of. Nor hath this Author any other way than common *Tradition*, (on which he is not willing that we should lay weight,) whereby to guess, which is the First, or which is the Seventh day, in such a Circulation of Weeks, either from the *Creation*, or even from *Christ's Time*.

I am sufficiently satisfied that we ought to keep a *Sabbath*, that is, *a day of Holy Rest, after Six days of ordinary Labour*, according to the Fourth Commandment; and this in a continued Course or Circulation. But I am not certain, nor can I be, which

is a First, or a Seventh day in such a Circulation of Weeks from the Creation. And therefore shall content my self to observe that day which I find observed in the Church where I live. In *Old England* I observe the Sabbath which here I find; And if I were in *New-England*, I would observe the Sabbath which I find observed there. Though I think it may be disputable whether they and we may be said to observe the same day, (the First Meridian passing between them and us.) And yet I would not advise to have it changed in either.

Now I can hardly think, that God hath laid the great stress of so weighty a Point (as whereon the main of Gods publick Worship doth much depend) on such a Circumstance as is impossible for us to know, and of which we may be modestly ignorant.

I should rather think that what Christ says of the *Place*, *Joh.* 4. 21, 23, *The hour cometh when ye shall neither in this Mountain nor in Jerusalem worship the Father, but the true worshipers shall worship the Father in Spirit and in Truth*, is in good measure true of the *Time* also; And, as it is not so material whether in this or that *Place*, God be Worshiped, so he be *Worshiped Aright*: So neither is it so material, whether on this, or that *day*; as, that a *Sabbath* or day of *Holy Rest* be duly kept. The publick Worship of God, was then in great measure confined to the *Temple*; not indifferently, *in any place within thy Gates*, but in the place *which the Lord thy God shall chuse, to put his name there*, Deut. 16. 6, 11, 15, 16. For which any other place may *now* be as well assigned; that men pray *every where lifting up holy hands*, &c. 1 *Tim.* 2. 8. (Privately in private places, and Publickly in places appointed for the publick.) And I do not think we are now more confined to the *Jewish Sabbath*, than to the *Jewish Temple*.

This premised, I can agree with this Author in many things by him discussed.

I agree, that *Our Lord Jesus Christ* (according to his *Divinity*) was *God* (and is so) the *true God*, the God that *made Heaven and Earth, the God who delivered the Law upon Mount Sinai*. For though we do acknowledge, in the Godhead, a *Trinity of Persons*; Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, (whereof Christ according to his Divinity is called the *Second Person*, the *Son of God*, or *God the Son*;) yet those *Three Persons* are but *One God*. Nor do I know any other *true God* but *One*, The *God that made Heaven and Earth*, The *Lord Jehovah*, The *God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*, The *Lord God of Israel*, The *Lord their God who brought them out of the Land of Egypt, out of the House of Bondage*, and besides whom

whom we are to have no Other God, The God who *delivered the Law to them on Mount Sinai*; And I do agree that *Our Lord Jesus Christ, is* (as to his Divinity) *this* God, the *True* God, the *onely true God*, and that he was so before his Incarnation. How far each of those Actions are to be ascribed to this or that *Person of the Trinity*, we need not be over solicitous. What in the New Testament is more peculiarly ascribed to this or that of the Three Persons, is in the Old Testament wont to be ascribed to *God* indefinitely, without such particular application; the doctrine of the Trinity being then not so distinctly discovered. But I cannot agree that Christ as *God and Man* (in contradistinction to the *Father and Holy Ghost*) did all those things; for he was not then *Man*.

I agree with him also, that God who made the World in *Six* days, *Rested the Seventh day*, Gen. 2. 2, 3. Exod. 20. 11. And that he *Blessed the Sabbath day and Hallowed it*. And that accordingly he hath appointed after *Six* days of ordinary *Labour*, Man should observe a *Seventh* day of *Holy Rest*, and this in a continued succession.

But I should rather say, that *our Lord Jesus Christ is* (according to his Divinity) *that God who Blessed the Seventh day* Gen. 2. than that *the God who Blessed the Sabbath day, is the Lord Jesus Christ*; (as he doth *p.* 64. and elsewhere very often, seeming to lay great stress upon it.) For he was not then the *Lord Christ* (God and Man) nor did he bless it as *Christ*, but as *God*; in Union with the Father and Holy Ghost, not as contradistinguished from them.

I agree also, that the Law of the *Sabbath* is one of the *Decalogue* or *Ten Commandments* delivered to *Israel* on Mount *Sinai*, Ex. 20. But I am willing to think it was a Law before. Not only because we find it observed, *Exod.* 16. (before the giving of the Law on Mount *Sinai*, Ex. 20.) but especially because of that in *Gen.* 2. 3. *God blessed the Seventh day and Sanctified it, because in it he rested from all his Work*. And those who are most averse to the Morality (as it is wont to be called) or the *Perpetuity* of the *Sabbath*, or *Day of Holy Rest*, and are yet very zealous for the *Holiness of Places*, would be very fond of it if they could find so clear a Testimony, and so ancient, for the holiness of *Place*, as here is for that of *Time*.

I agree also that the Law of the *Decalogue* or *Ten Commandments*, though then given peculiarly to *Israel*, is Obligatory to *Us* also. For though some Clauses therein do peculiarly respect them; as that *who brought thee out of the land of Egypt out of the*

house of bondage, and *that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee*, (which I think is there said with a particular respect to the land of *Canaan*, which God *gave* to *Israel*, not to us;) yet the Body of that Law and the preceptive part of it, I take to be Obligatory to others also, and to Us in particular; the Decalogue being *Declarative* of what was (I think) a *Law before* (however neglected or forgotten,) and is by Christ and his Apostles frequently cited as such, even to Gentiles as well as Jews.

Nor will I dispute it with him, whether the *Sabbath* were observed *from the Creation to the Floud*. For I am willing to think that if it were not, it should have been; though, in the short History that *Moses* gives us of that time, there be no mention made of such Observation. But I doubt it was not *universally* so observed, if at all. For when *all flesh had corrupted their ways*, I doubt the Sabbath day and the worship of that day were by them not much regarded. Nor do I find (*Gen.* 2. 3.) any *express Command* (such as he demands for the *First days* Sabbath) that it should be observed thenceforth by Men, *every Seventh day* of the Week *for ever*. How far the words *he blessed and sanctified it* may extend I will not dispute. It may be a *strong Intimation* (and I think it is,) But it is not expresly said, that, *All Mankind must for ever after, observe every Seventh day, in every Week, of days, reckoned continually from the first Creation*. Nor do I think it necessary to have been so recorded by *Moses*, (any more, than the Law for *Sacrifices*,) if it did otherwise appear to have been the Will of God. And therefore I would not have him lay too great a stress, on what he saith, that *there is no express Commandment, Recorded in the New Testament, for observing the First day*: It is enough if we there find sufficient Intimation for us to judge that God was pleased to have it observed.

I say the like as to the time from the Floud to that of *Abraham*, and from thence to the coming of *Israel* out of *Egypt*. For I do not find any mention of their observing a Sabbath (either in the Writings of *Moses*, or the Book of *Job*) earlier than that of *Exod.* 16. after *Israels* coming out of *Egypt*, and after the time that God is said to have *made a statute and ordinance for them, at Marah*, Ex. 15. 25. What that Statute and Ordinance was, we cannot tell. The Jewish Writers think (or some of them) that it was that of the *Sabbath*; and perhaps it might, or this be some part of it. It was perhaps a Revival of what had been before disused. Nor is it likely that their Task-Masters in *Egypt* would

would ſuffer them to be Idle, and neglect their Work, one whole day in Seven.

Nor do I find any foot-ſteps in Hiſtory that any other Nation but the Jews did (for many Ages after this time) ſo much as meaſure out their time by Weeks.

I know that many Learned and Pious men have been ſearching to that purpoſe and willing to lay hold on any thing that might ſeem to look that way. And I ſhould be well enough pleaſed to ſee it made out. But I have not ſeen any thing convictive to give me ſatisfaction therein.

I have conſulted *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and what he cites in the Fifth Book of his *Stromata*, who hath I believe made the beſt ſearch of any into Heathen Writers for that purpoſe. His deſign in that Book is to ſhew that the Heathens had ſtollen or borrowed much of their *Philoſophy* from what he calls *Philoſophia Barbara*, or *Barbarorum*, meaning thereby the *Jewiſh Learning*; (for, with the *Greeks*, all but themſelves were *Barbarians*.) And amongſt many other things, he takes notice of the number *Seven* ſometimes mentioned in Heathen Writers, as with ſome veneration; which he thinks to be occaſioned from that number oft mentioned in the Sacred Writers, and particularly from that of their *Sabbath*, and meaſuring their time by *Weeks*. But he doth not at all intimate as if himſelf did think the *Heathens* ſo to have divided their time, or to keep that Sabbath, but only that they were acquainted with the Jewiſh Learning, and borrowed much of theirs from thence.

That which therein ſeemed to me the moſt promiſing (and by others alſo is oft alledged) was that Cited from *Heſiod*, ἑ ἑβδόμη ἱερὸν ἦμαρ (*the Seventh a Sacred day.*) But when I conſulted the place in *Heſiod*, in his Ἔργα ϗ ἡμέραι, (in the latter part of which he treats of *Days*) I find nothing there of *Weeks*, or *days of the Week*, but only *days of the Month*. For 'tis this he there propoſeth to ſpeak of, πεντάδα μηνὸς, (*the Thirty days of the Month*,) on which he makes divers Remarks; as, which of them were to be accounted *Good days*, and which *Bad days*, and, for *what purpoſes*. And begins with theſe,

Πρῶτον, ἕνη, τετράδί τε, ϗ ἑβδόμη, ἱερὸν ἦμαρ,
Τῇ γὰρ Ἀπόλλωνα χρυσάορα γείνατο Λητώ.

(*Begin we with the Firſt, and the Fourth, and the Seventh, a Sacred day; Becauſe that on this day* Apollo *who hath the Golden Sword*

Sword was born of Latona.) So that (it ſeems) the *Seventh* day (not the *Firſt*) was then *Sunday*. (For *Apollo with his Gold Sword*, is but another name for the *Sun*.) But it was the Seventh day of the *Month*, not the Seventh day of the *Week*, (for of *Weeks* he there ſays nothing.) And he then goes on to ſpeak of the *Eighth* and *Ninth* days; then of the *Eleventh* and *Twelfth*, next of the *Thirteenth*, and ſo of other days of the Month; ſhewing which of them were accounted *Lucky* days, and which *Unlucky*, and *for what Affairs*. But nothing of Weeks at all.

However, *Heſiod* himſelf, though one of the Oldeſt of the Heathen Writers, is but young as to the times we ſpeak of; who is reckoned to have lived about the time of King *Uzziah*, Seven Hundred years after the time we are now conſidering, upon the coming of *Iſrael* out of *Egypt*. Nor doth *Clemens Alexandrinus* think, when they name *Seven*, it was from any *Old Tradition* (from *Adam* or *Noah*) but from what acquaintance they then had with the Jewiſh Writers of later time.

Nor do I find any thing that is more to the purpoſe, in all there Cited by *Clemens Alexandrinus* than this of *Heſiod*. But if any where he could have found, that the *Heathens divided their Time by Weeks*; no doubt but he would have mentioned this as *borrowed from the Jewiſh Learning*; (which was the thing he was there inquiring after.) And, when he ſaith nothing of it, we may be ſure he could not find it. I find indeed that ſome of the Heathens (as *Juvenal* and *Lucian*) do laugh or jeer at the Jewiſh Sabbath (*recutitaque Sabbata pallent*) and therefore did *know* of the Jewiſh Sabbath; But not that they did obſerve it, or ſo much as divide their Time by Weeks.

Now if we ſhould admit, that in ſome Families (where the true Worſhip of God was preſerved) there be a ſtrong preſumption (for 'tis no more) that they did obſerve a *Sabbath*; that is, a *Seventh day of Holy Reſt after Six days of ordinary Labour*; yet 'tis a queſtion, whether that were juſt the Seventh day in a continual ſucceſſion of Weeks from the Creation.

And if at any time there chance to be an intermiſſion, and the day forgotten, it is impoſſible (without a Miracle or a new Revelation) that it can be reſtored again. And if from thenceforth they would again keep a Sabbath (as we find the Paſs-over was revived by *Hezekiah* and *Joſiah* which had been long intermitted 2 *Kings* 23. and 2 *Chr.* 25.) they muſt begin at adventure, and thence continue it.

Now if we conſider, that the true Worſhip of God was at re-

duced

duced to ſome one family, as in the time of *Noah*, and perhaps of *Abraham*; and even that Family ſometimes corrupt enough, (as was that of *Nahor*, from whence *Abraham* for that reaſon was removed; and that of *Laban* where *Jacob* ſojourned; and how oft alſo the like happened, we cannot tell) It was very poſſible the *Sabbath* might be neglected; as himſelf obſerves *p.* 63, it had been *before and under the Captivity for a long time*, and made *a Market-day*, as well as any other day of the Week; like as the *Temple* was become a *Market-place*, *Mat.* 21. 12, 13. *Joh.* 2. 14. 16. As was alſo the Paſs-over in great meaſure from the time of *Samuel* till that of *Joſiah*, 2 *Chr.* 35. 18. And the Feaſt of *Tabernacles*, from the days of *Joſhuah* to *Nehemiah*, Neh. 8. 17. And Circumciſion, for Forty years together in the Wilderneſs, *Joſh.* 5. 5.

Now if *Circumciſion* and the *Paſs-over* and the Feaſt of *Tabernacles* were thus neglected when they were *at Liberty*; how much more the *Sabbath*, when they were *Bond-men* in *Egypt*; of which we have not the leaſt mention from God's keeping a Sabbath, *Gen.* 2. 3. till after Iſraels coming out of *Egypt*, *Exod.* 16.

Nor is there the leaſt mention (as I ſhew'd but now) in any Hiſtory Sacred or Profane, ſo much as of dividing their time by *Weeks*, all that time; nor, except that of Iſrael, for many Ages after.

And though the *Sun*, *Moon and Stars* (*Gen.* 1. 14.) are ſaid to be *for Signs and for Seaſons*, *for Days and for Years*, yet not a word is there of *Weeks*. Nor could they indeed, by their Motions, diſtinguiſh *Weeks*, as they do *Months* and *Years*. And therefore though I find *Years* and *Months* to have been obſerved all the World over long ago; yet *Weeks* no where (that I know) of ancient times, but by the Nation of the *Jews* onely, nor by them before their coming out of *Egypt*.

So that, though, I am willing to think, the Sabbath *ought* to have been obſerved all that while, yet there is too much reaſon to doubt it *was not*; or, if at all, not without frequent intermiſſions, which would, in this caſe, be fatal.

Now to argue as he doth, that *Abel*, and *Enoch*, and *Noah*, and *Abraham*, were *good men*, and are (ſome of them) ſaid to *walk with God*, and to *keep his Commandments*, and therefore may be preſumed to have *kept a Sabbath*, is but a weak argument as to matter of *Fact*, and, to *begg the Queſtion*. For we are not to think them *ſo good* as to be guilty of no *failings* or *omiſſions*.

The Law of *Marriage* is certainly as Old, if not Older than that of the *Sabbath*, the tenour of which was (he tells us *p.* 62.) that *they Two ſhould be one fleſh*; *not*, *they Three*, *Four or Five*: yet he

he tells us alſo, that *Polygamy, or having many Wives, was frequently practiſed, from Lamech to Malachi, even by ſome eminent in the Church at that time, and by them (he ſuppoſeth) held to be lawful.* And it may as well be thought, the Law for the *Sabbath* might ſometime within that *Two Thouſand Five Hundred Years*) be neglected and forgotten; as that of *Marriage*; In a time when there was no writing (that we know of) to preſerve it. And, if once forgotten, it could never (as to *that* Seventh day) be recovered.

And I would ask that Gentleman, In caſe the day ſhould chance to have been ſometime forgotten, (as is very poſſible and not unlikely,) and that after ſuch time (upon finding *the Book of the Law*, as in *Joſiah*'s time 2 *Kings* 22. 8. which had been loſt) it did appear that a *Sabbath ſhould have been kept*, but was not, (as was there the caſe of the *Paſs-over*, *Chap.* 23. 21.) What doth this Gentleman think (in ſuch caſe) ſhould be done? Muſt they *never Reſtore the Sabbath* becauſe they do not know the day? Or muſt they begin upon a *New Account*? I ſhould think this latter; (and that it would be warranted by the *Fourth Commandment*;) notwithſtanding his Objection, No *other day* (but the Seventh from the Creation) *is Commanded*; No *Promiſe* to the Obſervance of *any other*; nor *Threatning* for the Omiſſion.

Indeed in our days when ſo great a part of the World reckon by *Weeks*, and we be ſtored with Aſtronomical Tables adjuſted to the Motions of the Sun, Moon and Stars, and many Celeſtial Obſervations, (as for Inſtance, that ſuch a Year, ſuch a Day of ſuch a Month there was an Eclipſe on Monday morning or the like) 'twere more eaſy to rectify ſuch an intermiſſion. But in thoſe days, when there was nothing of all this, nor ſo much as the uſe of Writing (that we know of) older than *Moſes*; There was no way to rectify an interrupted Tradition.

All which is not ſaid to diſparage the Obſervation of the Sabbath day (for which I have as great Veneration as he that pleads for the *Saturday* Sabbath,) But onely to ſhew, that we can be at no Certainty, (and ſcarce a Conjecture,) which is the Firſt, Second, or Seventh day of the Week in a continued Circulation of Weeks from the Creation. And conſequently I cannot think that the great ſtreſs of the Fourth Commandment is to be underſtood of juſt *that* Seventh day in every ſuch Week from the Creation (which I doubt cannot be known) But rather that there ſhould be a Weekly Sabbath; that is, after Six days of Work, the Seventh ſhould be a Holy Reſt, and then, after another Six days of Work, the Seventh ſhould be again a Holy Reſt; and ſo continu-

tinually; which is as truly obſerved in the Sunday-Sabbath, as in that of Saturday.

As when God requires *the Tenth* of our *Increaſe*; it is not meant of the Tenth *in Order* (for it ſhould rather be the Firſt in Order, for he requires the *Firſt-fruits*) but the Tenth in *Proportion*; So here the *Seventh*.

And this Author knows very well, that it is ſignally noted by Expoſitors on the Fourth Commandment, and other Writers about the Sabbath, That this Commandment begins with *Remember to keep Holy the Sabbath-day*, or the day of Reſt, (not the *Seventh day*; much leſs the Seventh day of the Week *from the firſt Creation*;) And what is that day of Reſt, the next Words tell us, *Six days ſhalt thou labour, but the Seventh is the Sabbath, &c.* That is, after Six days of Labour, the Seventh ſhall be a day of Reſt. And in the cloſe of that Commandment (*Ex.*20. 11.) our Bibles have it *wherefore the Lord bleſſed the Sabbath-day* (not as we commonly repeat it, the *Seventh* day) *and hallowed it.* The Reaſon given to inforce it is, *For in Six days the Lord made Heaven and Earth* &c. *and reſted the Seventh day*, and accordingly ſhould we, after Six days of Work have a Seventh day of Reſt, and ſo onward.

If he thinks that to make a difference, that we now reckon our Weeks to begin with the day of Reſt, and after that, Six Working days (which in a continued Circulation comes all to one,) I will allow that Gentleman (if that will pleaſe him better) to begin the Week on *Monday*, and then Sunday will be the *Seventh*. The Commandment ſays nothing of the *Seventh* day of the Week in a continued Succeſſion *from the Creation*; but *the Seventh day* after *Six days of Labour*.

And whereas he obſerves (and would lay great weight upon it) that it is (*haſhebigni*) *the Seventh* (the article *ha* anſwering to our *the*) not *a Seventh*. 'Tis very true, and very proper ſo to be. For the meaning is not that, after *Six* days of Labour, there ſhould be a *Seventh* for Reſt *no matter when*; but *the Seventh* day, that is, *the next* day after thoſe Six. But it is not ſaid *the Seventh in Courſe from the Creation*. Juſt as when it is ſaid, a Male-Child is to be Circumciſed *the Eighth day*, it is not meant of an Eighth day in Courſe from the *Creation*; but, *the Eighth day* from *the Birth*. And in like manner *Ex.* 12. 16. *In the Seventh day there ſhall be a Holy Convocation*; it is not meant of the *Seventh day of the Week* from the Creation; but on the Seventh day of the *Feaſt of unleavened Bread*, what ever day of the Week that happen to be. And